

BYZANTINISCHE FORSCHUNGEN

Internationale Zeitschrift für
Byzantinistik

herausgegeben

von

ADOLF M. HAKKERT und WALTER E. KAEGI, Jr.

BAND IX



VERLAG ADOLF M. HAKKERT - AMSTERDAM
1985

I.S.B.N. 90-256-0619-9
I.S.B.N. 90-256-0914-7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I. WOMEN AND MONASTICISM	
The Editors: Explanatory Note	VII
A.WEYL CARR: Women and Monasticism in Byzantium	1
E.A.CLARK: Authority and Humility: A Conflict of Values in Fourth-Century Female Monasticism	17
D.DE F.ABRAHAMSE: Women's Monasticism in the Middle Byzantine Period: Problems and Prospects	35
A.E.LAIOU: Observations on the Life and Ideology of Byzantine Women	59
A.-M.TALBOT: Late Byzantine Nuns: By Choice or Necessity?	103
A.C.HERO: Irene-Eulogia Choumnaina Palaiologina Abbess of the Convent of Philanthropos Soter in Constantinople	119
PART II. ARTICLES ON BYZANTINE INSTITUTIONS AND EXTERNAL WARFARE	
J.-L.v.DIETEN: Zum "Bellum Avaricum" des Georgios Pisides. Bemerkungen zu einer Studie von Paul Speck	149
H.INALCIK: The Rise of the Turcoman Maritime Principalities in Anatolia, Byzantium, and Crusades	179
R.-J.LILIE: Das "Zweikaiserproblem" und sein Einfluss auf die Aussenpolitik der Komnenen	219
J.ROSSER: The Role of the Great Isthmus Corridor in the Slavonic Invasions	245
J.P.THOMAS: The Crisis of Byzantine Ecclesiastical Foundations, 964-1025	255

WOMEN AND MONASTICISM

EXPLANATORY NOTE

On Friday, 13 November 1981, a session of the Seventh Annual Byzantine Studies Conference, which was hosted by Boston University, was devoted to the subject of «Women and Monasticism». Professor Annemarie Weyl Carr chaired this session, which included her Introduction and the following five papers. The individual authors revised and expanded their respective papers where appropriate to take account of scholarly discussion that followed the reading of their papers. They are published in the order in which they were read.

THE EDITORS

WOMEN AND MONASTICISM IN BYZANTIUM: INTRODUCTION FROM AN ART HISTORIAN

ANNEMARIE WEYL CARR / DALLAS, TEXAS

Led by the highly visible figures of the imperial court, the Byzantine woman is making her way into the light of scholarly investigation.¹ Her presence there should need no justification. It raises basic questions about social, economic and interpersonal order within the Empire that are central to historical study throughout the Byzantine field. The five articles which follow were composed for a session on women and monasticism at the Seventh Annual Byzantine Studies Conference.² They exemplify the insights into Byzantine society which the study of its women can offer.³

¹ Charles Diehl's two books, *Byzantine Empresses* (London, 1927) and *Figures byzantines* (Paris, 1939) remain classics. More recently, see J. Beaucamp, «La situation juridique de la femme à Byzance», *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 20 (1977): 145-76; R. Browning, «An Unpublished Funeral Oration on Anna Comnena», *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, n.s. 8 (1962): 1-12; J. Darrouzès, *Georges et Démétrios Tornikès. Lettres et discours* (Paris, 1979), pp. 220-328; J. Grosdidier de Matons, «La femme dans l'empire byzantin», in *Histoire mondiale de la femme* (Paris, 1967), 3: 11-43; V. Laurent, «La direction spirituelle des grandes dames à Byzance» *Revue des études byzantines* 8 (1950): 64-84; V. Laurent, «Un princesse byzantine au cloître», *Echos d'orient* 29 (1930): 29-60; S. Runciman, «The Empress Irene the Athenian», in *Medieval Women*, ed. by D. Baker (Oxford, 1978), pp. 101-18.

² The Seventh Annual Byzantine Studies Conference was held on November 13-15, 1981, at Boston University in Boston, Massachusetts. The session on Women and Monasticism was organized by Professors Alice-Mary Maffrey Talbot and Dorothy deFerrante Abrahamse. I owe particular thanks to Dr. Talbot for her generous help in encouraging my work. I thank Professor Eleanor Tufts, too, for the stimulus she gave to my interest in medieval women's art.

³ In addition to her article here, see also Alice-Mary M. Talbot's rich article, «Bluestocking Nuns: Intellectual Life in the Convents of Late Byzantium», *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 (1983): forthcoming.

In the area of art history, too, the study of women and monasticism addresses basic issues in our understanding of the circumstances and organization of artistic production. There is as yet no study of women in Byzantine art. Pursuit of the woman artist has progressed considerably farther in western medieval history.⁴ Here, a number of recognizable patterns have emerged. Women artists are best found in the monastic scriptorium or in the creation of fine textiles. The latter was the work of both lay and monastic women throughout the Middle Ages.⁵ The book trade had been professionalized in the major university centers by the thirteenth century, and here, too, lay women appear among the full range of workers from parchmenters to painters.⁶ It is in the luxury book trade a century later that the first great «name» painters of medieval Europe appear, and with them comes the pattern remarked so often in subsequent centuries of European art, of the father and daughter team.⁷ With the commercialization of book production in the fifteenth century, women became a significant part of the labor force.⁸ Within these various contexts, a number of notable women appear.

The Byzantine woman has proved harder to discover, for several reasons. A larger proportion of Greek medieval art has perished. More importantly, the etiquette of anonymity was more scrupu-

⁴ See A.W. Carr, «Women Artists in the Middle Ages,» *The Feminist Art Journal* 5 (1976): 5-9 and 26; D. Miner, *Anastaise and Her Sisters* (Baltimore, Md., 1974).

⁵ For lay women, see the thirteenth-century English woman, Maude, in R.K. Lancaster, «Artists, Suppliers and Clerks: The Human Factor in the Art Patronage of King Henry III,» *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 35 (1972): 83-85; or the earlier women, Adelhaide, wife of Hugh Capet in tenth-century France, Aelgiva, wife of King Ethelred in England in 1016, and Gisela, Queen of Stephen I of Hungary in the early eleventh century, all in U. Thieme and F. Becker, *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler* (Leipzig, 1908), 1: 79, 96; 14: 197.

⁶ See R. Branner on the parchmenter, Martha, in «Manuscript Makers in Mid-Thirteenth-Century Paris,» *Art Bulletin* 48 (1966): 65.

⁷ See M. Meiss, *French Painting in the Time of Jean de Berry* (London, 1967), p. 3 on Bourgot, daughter of Jehan de Noir.

⁸ F. Baron, *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques*, n.s. 4 (1964): 37-121; Miner (as in note 3 above), p. 24.

lously honored in Byzantium. Greek scribes are among the most reticent in the Middle Ages to give information about themselves, and miniaturists' names survive only by the rarest accident;⁹ signed wall paintings are few, and signed icons almost unknown;¹⁰ and the

⁹ On scribes, see H. Husmann's comparisons of Greek, Georgian and Syrian manuscripts on Mount Sinai in «Die datierten griechischen Sinai-Handschriften des IX. bis XVI. Jahrhunderts, Herkunft und Schreiber,» *Ostkirchliche Studien* 27 (1978): 143-68, or C. Wendel on the lowliness of the Greek scribe in «Die ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΤΗΣ des griechischen Schreibermönches,» *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 43 (1950): 259-66. Among miniaturists, see the eight names in Vatican, gr. 1613: I. Ševčenko, «The Illuminators of the Menologion of Basil II,» *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16 (1962): 243-76, and, I. Ševčenko, «On Pantoleon the Painter,» *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 21 (1972): 241-49. It is more difficult to assess the claims of Theophanes in Melbourne, National Gallery 710/5 and Barnabas in Athens, Benaki Museum 34.3, both of whom claim to have copied and illuminated the books in question for their own use, Barnabas as a private copy and Theophanes as a gift edition: H. Buchthal, *An Illuminated Byzantine Gospel Book* (Melbourne, 1961), p. 1; A. Cutler and A.W. Carr, «The Psalter Benaki 34.3. An Unpublished Illuminated Manuscript from the Family 2400,» *Revue des études byzantines* 34 (1976): 314-15.

¹⁰ Among icons, note K. Weitzmann's discussion of the signature — «the earliest known to me» — by the bilingual Stephanos on the icon of the Prophet Elijah on Mount Sinai: K. Weitzmann, *The Icon. Holy Images — Sixth to Fourteenth Century* (New York, 1978), p. 97. As to wall paintings, there may have been a signature at the base of the Good Thief's cross in the twelfth-century mural of the Crucifixion at Abu Ghosh near Jerusalem: C. Diehl, «Les fresques de l'église d'Abou Gosch,» *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* (1924): 93. Theodore Apseudes signed the Anastasis in the cell of St. Neophytus at the Enkleistra in Cyprus in 1183: C. Mango and E.J.W. Hawkins, «The Hermitage of St. Neophytos and Its Wall Paintings,» *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 20 (1966): 193. The signatures of monumental painters become much more numerous in the fourteenth century, with Michael and Eutyches working for King Milutin, Kalliergis at Verria, Manuel Panselinos on Mount Athos, and Manuel Eugenikos at Calendjha: see H. Hallensleben, *Die Malerschule des Königs Milutin* (Giessen, 1964); A. Xyngopoulos, *Thessalonique et la peinture macédonienne* (Athens, 1955), pp. 27-29; A. Xyngopoulos, *Manuel Pansélinos* (Athens, 1956); H. Belting, «Le peintre Manuel Eugenikos de Constantinople, en Géorgie,» *Cahiers archéologiques* 28 (1979): 103-14.

handful of artists named in texts or legal documents can almost never be associated with surviving works.¹¹ Finally and most significantly, the social and economic structure of the Byzantine workshop is not understood, and it is by no means clear what kind of person produced art or under what circumstances. In the face of these difficulties, one is thrown back on oblique methods of investigation: a perusal of surviving monastic typika drawn up for women's institutions; an examination of legal documents associated with these institutions; a search among inscriptions in surviving manuscripts that might cast light on convent libraries; a study of eulogies and biographies of women; and a survey of hagiographic material.

The evidence yielded so far by these sources is meagre. It does show, however, that the western patterns occur in Byzantium, as well. In Byzantium, too, women figure among the major cultural patrons, from the early Byzantine empress, Eudocia, and the sixth-century Juliana Anicia through the Iconodule empress, Eirene, to the women of the Comnenian and Palaeologan courts.¹² Chalandon uses Bertha von Sulzbach's unfortunate relation with John Tzetzes to show how implicitly Tzetzes expected lavish patronage from a woman of Bertha's position;¹³ certainly Anna Comnena had spon-

¹¹ The great exception is Pantoleon: see Ševčenko, «On Pantoleon the Painter» (as in note 9). I remain skeptical of M.V. Ščepkina's assignment of the Chludov Psalter to Lazarus: *Miniatyuri Khludovskoy Psaltyri* (Moscow, 1977), pp. 317-18.

¹² On Eudocia, see W. Loerke, «The Trials of Christ in the Rossano Gospels,» *Art Bulletin* 43 (1961): 189-90, note 96. On Juliana Anicia, see C. Mango and I. Ševčenko, «Remains of the Church of St. Polyeuktos at Constantinople,» *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 15 (1961): 243. On Eirene, see A. Grabar, *L'iconoclasme byzantin* (Paris, 1957), pp. 173-76.

¹³ F. Chalandon, *Jean II Comnène (1118-1143) et Manuel I Comnène (1143-1180)* (Paris, 1912), pp. 209-11.

sored a literary salon of note;¹⁴ and Bertha's contemporary, Eirene Sebastocratorissa, was the center of a literary circle and the likely patron of John Kokkinobaphos, whose homilies on the Virgin survive in two of the twelfth century's most splendidly illuminated volumes.¹⁵ The finest books in Buchthal and Belting's late thirteenth-century group of luxury codices were commissioned by a woman of the Palaeologan house, perhaps the learned Theodora Rhaoulina.¹⁶ Again as in the West, the production of books and fine textiles offers the most generous sources of women craftspeople in Byzantium, and they appear there in both lay and monastic contexts. Johnstone has found the names of both lay and monastic women — albeit very late — as embroiderers.¹⁷ And the four women scribes from the Byzantine period whose works are known include two nuns — Anna in Escorial, gr. 530,¹⁸ and Maria in

¹⁴ Darrouzès (as in note 1), pp. 20-24; Browning (as in note 1), p. 7. We know nothing about Anna as a patron of art: her lack of information on works of art in the *Alexiad* is conspicuous. She did as a young woman write poems on a pair of icons, however. Both icons were novel in content, suggesting that they were made for her: J.N. Sola, «De Codice Laurentiano X plutei V,» *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 20 (1911): 375-76; A.W. Carr, «Gospel Frontispieces from the Comnenian Period,» *Gesta* 21,1 (1982): 9.

¹⁵ Browning (as in note 1), p. 8; Chalandon (as in note 13), pp. 212-13. On the Kokkinobaphos manuscripts, Vatican, gr. 1162 and Paris, B.N., gr. 1208, and their association with Eirene, see J.C. Anderson, «An Examination of Two Twelfth-Century Centers of Byzantine Manuscript Production» (Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation for Princeton University, 1975), p. 55.

¹⁶ H. Buchthal and H. Belting, *Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople. An Atelier of Late Byzantine Book Illumination and Calligraphy*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 16 (Washington, D.C., 1978), pp. 100-102. On Theodora as a scribe, see note 21 below.

¹⁷ P. Johnstone, *The Byzantine Tradition of Church Embroidery* (London, 1967), pp. 59-62.

¹⁸ G. de Andrés, *Catálogo de los códices griegos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial*, 3 vols. (Madrid, 1965-67), 3: 168. The book contains sermons of John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria; Anna's signature is on folio 61v.

Moscow, Historical Museum, S S268 ^{cccxxx},¹⁹ one lay person — Eirene, the daughter of Theodore Hagiopetrites —,²⁰ and Theodora Rhaoulina herself, whose career as a learned figure embraces both the lay and the religious phases of her life.²¹ All four belong to the early Palaeologan period. As in the West, finally, the emergence of the independent «name» specialist is accompanied by the appearance of the father/daughter team. This is illustrated by the calligrapher, Eirene, the daughter of Theodore Hagiopetrites. Her work is known from Mount Sinai 1256, a Heirmologion whose musical notation was furnished by no less a figure than John Koukouzeles.²² Though it was copied in 1309, the year after Theodore's death, it contains a type of text that does not occur in the highly specialized list of his known commissions, and so seems unlikely to have been a work of his own that he left unfinished. Eirene must have had her own clientele. Three centuries later in

¹⁹ M. Vogel and V. Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Leipzig, 1909), p. 288.

²⁰ Husmann (as in note 9), p. 15; Wendel (as in note 8), p. 265; A.W. Carr, «A Note on Theodore Hagiopetrites,» *Scriptorium* 35 (1981): 287-90. Robert Nelson is preparing a monograph on Theodore Hagiopetrites.

²¹ G. Prato, «Scritture librerie arcaizzanti della prima età dei Paleologi e loro modelli,» *Scrittura e civiltà* 3 (1979): 165, note 33, calls Vatican, gr. 1899 «un manoscritto da lei stessa vergato,» a judgment offered also by A. Turyn, *Codices Graeci Vaticani Saeculis XIII et XIV Scripti Annorumque Notis Instructi* (Vatican City, 1969), ms. 40, pp. 63-65, and S. Kugéas, «Zur Geschichte der Münchner Thukydideshandschrift Augustanus F,» *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 16 (1907): 594. Kugéas gives Theodora's biography on pp. 590-609; she became a nun after the death of her second husband. Along with the scribes cited, Vogel and Gardthausen (as in note 19), p. 401, list Sophia, daughter of Rikos Kontoioannes, who signed Simopetra 1377 in 1469 with the words «πολλοῦ κόπου καὶ μόχθου, ὅτι δέ εἰμι ἀμαθὴς τε καὶ γυνή — a case of scribal ταπεινότης? Unfortunately, the manuscript is presumably lost with the rest of the Simopetra library.

²² Husmann (as in note 9), p. 156, identifies the single leaf, Leningrad, Public Library, gr. 329, as a leaf missing from Mount Sinai 1256. On John Koukouzeles, see E.V. Williams, «John Koykoyzeles' Reform of Byzantine Chanting for Great Vespers in the Fourteenth Century» (Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation for Yale University, 1968).

the expatriate Greek community in Paris, we find another such team in the Vergicius family of Cretan calligraphers: Angelus Vergicius's edition of Manuel Philes's description of animals (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F 4 15, of 1564) may owe its illustrations to his daughter.²³

These examples show that the patterns seen in the West were also valid in Byzantium. They do not, however, show how far this validity extends. The eastern examples are at present radically much fewer and more isolated. This is particularly true of the scribe and illuminator. The convent scriptorium of Gisela at Chelles,²⁴ the scholarly community of the early twelfth century at Admont,²⁵ the sequence of Diemuds in Salzburg,²⁶ Reglindis and Herrad of Landsberg at Hohenburg,²⁷ the Dominican convent scribes of the fourteenth century in Germany find no counterparts in Byzantium.²⁸ The East is poor in names, and does not begin to yield the splendid patina of painters that illuminates the roster of western women. Given the reticence of the Greek scribe, this dearth of signed works is not entirely surprising. Far less expected, on the other hand, has been the dearth of oblique evidence offered by monastic typika, saints' lives, library lists and *ex libris*.

²³ D. Harlfinger, «Zu griechischen Kopisten und Schriftsteller des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts,» in *La paléographie grecque et byzantine. Colloques du Centre nationale de la recherche scientifique*, 559 (Paris, 1977), p. 337. *Greek Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Exhibiton at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, 1966, no. 66.

²⁴ B. Bischoff, «Die Kölner Nonnenhandschriften und das Skriptorium von Chelles,» in *Karolingische und Ottonische Kunst, Werden, Wesen, Wirking. Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte und christlichen Archäologie*, 3 (Wiesbaden 1957), pp. 395-411.

²⁵ G. Cames, *Allégories et symboles dans l'Hortus Deliciarum* (Leiden, 1971), pp. 130-38.

²⁶ G. Swarzenski, *Die Salzburger Malerei* (Leipzig, 1913), p. 62.

²⁷ Cames (as in note 25), p. 138.

²⁸ C. von Heusinger, «Spätmittelalterliche Buchmalerei in oberrheinischen Frauenklöstern,» *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 107 (1959): 136-60.

The scant evidence of women as producers of books cannot be dismissed as a testimony to female illiteracy in Byzantium. Most middle and upper-class women in Byzantium, at least in the cities, would seem to have been literate.²⁹ Women were the ones who looked after the economy of the household; they clearly knew the Bible, and often seem to have taken in hand the education of their children.³⁰ Thus we find St. Theophano learning her letters from her mother;³¹ Constantine Psellos's mother taught her daughters and saw to it that their bedtime stories were biblical and edifying rather than fantastic;³² and Theodore the Studite's ambitious mother stayed awake nights trying by the light of her little lamp to bolster her own inadequate education in order to teach her offspring.³³ Outside court circles, such literacy was seldom developed beyond the most basic level. One reads pensively of the eagerness with which not only Constantine Psellos's mother but also his favorite sister hung on his every report of his higher education; and of the frustration of his mother when he was stumped by an assignment and she hadn't the education to assist him.³⁴ One gathers that she had propelled him into an education that she could not have, and wonders whether a similar story lurks behind Anna Comnena's report that Michael Psellos was so learned because his mother prayed assiduously to an icon of the Virgin for him.³⁵ Women like these — the mothers of St. Theodore the Studite, of Constantine Psellos, of St. Theophano, and even of the author of St. Theopha-

²⁹ A. Kazhdan, *Byzanz und seine Kultur* (Darmstadt, 1968), p. 55; Grosdidier de Matons (as in note 1), p. 29.

³⁰ Beaucamp (as in note 1), p. 167, points out that a woman's rights were equal to those of her husband only in the area of their children's education and up-bringing.

³¹ E. Kurtz, *Zwei griechische Texte über die Heilige Theophano, die Gemahlin Kaisers Leo VI.* Mémoires de l'académie impériale de sciences de St. Pétersbourg, Classe historico-philologique, 3, 2 (St. Petersburg, 1898), p. 48.

³² Diehl, *Figures byzantines* (as in note 1), p. 303.

³³ Ibid., p. 117

³⁴ Ibid., p. 293.

³⁵ Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad*, trans. by E.R.A. Sewter (Penguin Books, 1969), p. 175.

no's *Vita*³⁶ — were people of great mental energy. They poured this energy into household, prayer and charitable works, and the first two turned when their children were grown to lives of fiercely ascetic monasticism. In this phase of their lives they fell into a pattern found frequently in the lives of women saints: they pray fervently, lapse into ecstasy, are fearless in the defense of moral rectitude, and work with driving, mortifying intensity to help the poor. Such behavior was a *sine qua non* of a creditable saint's life. The truth that lies behind these lives cannot be glimpsed, but it seems clear that finely honed intellectual activity was not a direction in which the energy of the gifted woman was expected to exercise itself, even within the context of the religious life.

Within court circles, on the other hand, one finds a sequence of genuinely literary women. The caustic Kassia,³⁷ Eirene Doukaina,³⁸ Eirene Sebastocratorissa, Eirene-Eulogia Choumnaina,³⁹ Theodora Rhaoulina exemplify this group. Even here, however, two factors are striking. One is the difficulty encountered even by these figures in expanding their learning beyond the fairly narrow limits of devotional and sacred literature to embrace the secular realm of grammar and classical thought. Thus Anna Comnena relates that she received her parents' permission to study grammar only after she had made secret arrangements to take lessons from a court eunuch,⁴⁰ and it was only later still, after her marriage to Nicephorus Bryennius, that she engaged publicly and extensively in the study of grammar and philosophy.⁴¹ Yet her mother, Eirene Doukaina, was herself a studious person, and had

³⁶ Kurtz (as in note 31), p. ii.

³⁷ I. Rochow, *Studien zu der Person, den Werken und dem Nachleben der Dichterin Kassia*. Berliner Byzantinische Arbeiten, 38 (Berlin, 1967).

³⁸ See especially A. Comnena (as in note 35), pp. 110-11, 178.

³⁹ See Angela C. Hero's article in this volume.

⁴⁰ Darrouzès (as in note 1), p. 244; Browning (as in note 1), p. 5.

⁴¹ Darrouzès (as in note 1), p. 262.

encouraged Anna's education. Eirene's own intellectual pursuits were limited to devotional and theological material; though deeper and more literate, they were little broader in scope than the pragmatic moralism of her formidable mother-in-law, Anna Dalasena. It was probably a similar learning that she had envisaged for Anna. In the case of Eirene-Eulogia Choumnaina, too, Angela Hero comments on her fluent but far from flawless Greek:⁴² for her, as for Anna Comnena, the study of grammar must have been difficult. Such literacy was apparently rare for women, and Kassia, who did write secular verses, cast those on women in a caustic vein that suggests a certain bitterness toward her sex.⁴³ A second striking aspect of these women is the source of their education. Devotional and religious as the learning was that was conceived for them, there is little evidence that it was acquired in a convent. Anna Comnena turned to a court official for lessons in grammar, and never speaks of instruction at the hands of nuns; Eirene-Eulogia, though speaking in her *typikon* of young girls coming to her convent to be educated, was herself educated by the father.⁴⁴ The relation between learning and the convent is no clearer here than among the women outside the court, then.

The surviving women's *typika*, examined in depth by Angeliki Laiou, offer curiously little clarification of this relationship.⁴⁵ These documents are, as Laiou so tellingly points out, the works of women well acquainted with the economy of running a large household. The administrative affairs — as exemplified by Eirene Doukaina's *typikon* for the convent of the Virgin Kecharitomenos⁴⁶ — are meticulously spelled out, and they plainly presuppose a community of women well able to read, write and keep accounts.

⁴² Hero, in this volume.

⁴³ Rochow (as in note 37), p. 61.

⁴⁴ Laurent «Une princesse» (as in note 1), p. 54.

⁴⁵ See Angeliki Laiou's paper in this volume.

⁴⁶ L. Oeconomus, *La vie religieuse dans l'empire byzantin au temps des Comnènes et des Anges* (Paris, 1918), pp. 170-182.

Eirene herself was a taciturn, intelligent and literate person. Anna Comnena, who loved her, describes how she devoted her time to books, often appearing at table with a volume still in hand.⁴⁷ Yet Eirene made no provision in her typikon for a library, a glaring omission in the face of other aristocratic typika.⁴⁸ She did prescribe manual work, but it does not seem to have been of an intellectual or literary nature. Its charitable function suggests that it was perhaps weaving and sewing. One nun was to read while the others worked, and readings were also conducted during meals. But intellectual work as such does not seem to have been recognized. In the typikon formulated by Eirene-Eulogia Choumnaina, too, though there were two levels of sisters, one devoted to psalmody and one to common chores, the pursuit of intellectual work is not touched upon.⁴⁹ This is characteristic. The surviving typika give no insight into women as bookmen.

The scant testimony in the typika about women's use or production of books leads one to surviving codices, to see whether *ex libris* or colophons cast light on learned monastic womanhood in Byzantium. Here again, however, the evidence is sparse. That women owned books is clear. This is proved not only by the pretentious editions of courtly ladies like the Gospels of Catherine Comnena or

⁴⁷ A. Comnena (as in note 35), p. 178.

⁴⁸ Thus the library of Michael Attaleiates's monastery of Christ tou Panoiktirmos (1077) had forty books (F. Miklosich and I. Müller, *Acta et Diplomata Monasteriorum et Ecclesiarum Orientis* (Vienna, 1890), 5: 324-26, 470-71). The monastery of the Theotokos tou Salim in Edessa received seventy-four books in 1059 from a certain Eustathios Protospatharios (O. Volk, «Die byzantinische Klosterbibliotheken von Konstantinopel, Thessalonike und Kleinasien» Dissertation, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich, 1954, p. 147). Gregory Pakourianos endowed his monastery of Petritzos with thirty books (L. Petit, «Typikon de Grégoire Pacourianos pour le monastère de Petritzos (Backovo),» *Vizantiiskii Vremennik*, Prilozhenie to Vol. 11 (1904). There were sixty-eight books still in the fifteenth century in Bishop Manuel's foundation of the eleventh century at Stroumitza (L. Petit, *Le monastère de Notre Dame de Pitié*. *Izvestiia russkogo archeologiceskago Institut v' Konstantinopolie*, 6 (St. Petersburg, 1900), p. 23).

⁴⁹ Laurent, «Une princesse» (as in note 1), p. 50.

the volumes in Buchthal and Belting's group of the Palaiologina,⁵⁰ but by the more modest volumes of the «decorative style» group. These books seem to have been made in the provinces, largely for private ownership. Two of them were owned by or perhaps made for women: Mount Athos, Stauronikita 56 bears the *ex libris* of a nun, Euphrosyne, and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, grec 97 was probably made for the lay woman, Olympia, whose name occurs on several of its pages.⁵¹ Jerusalem, Saba 144 was brought to the church of St. Mary of the Germans in the late twelfth or thirteenth century by a nun, Matrona.⁵² Instances like these of individual ownership are not matched, however, by instances of ownership by a women's monastery. Isolated cases occur: Athens, National Library 204 was produced by a male scribe, but probably for the Pet- rion convent in Constantinople;⁵³ and Mount Sinai 221 of 1175 belonged at some point in its early history to the convent of the Eleousa near Candia in Crete.⁵⁴ Further insight fails, however: Volk's listing of monastic libraries of the Middle Ages in Constanti- nople, Macedonia and Asia Minor cites only one convent, and that one appears not because of the books it owned, but because of the depressing little story of a lost book which was unexpectedly reco-

⁵⁰ G. Vikan, *Gifts from the Byzantine Court* (Washington, D.C., 1980), pp. 1-8; Buchthal and Belting (as in note 16).

⁵¹ On Stauronikita 56, see O. Demus, «Studien zur byzantinischen Buchmalerei des 13. Jahrhunderts,» *Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 9 (1960): 78-89 and pl. 3, and Vogel and Gardthausen (as in note 19), p. 123, though Euphrosyne is certainly not the scribe. On Paris, B.N., gr. 97, see J. Darrouzès, «Notes pour servir à l'histoire de Chypre,» *Kupriakai Spoudai* 17 (1953): 87-88.

⁵² K. and S. Lake, *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200* (Cam- bridge, Mass., 1945), 10: 97.

⁵³ A. Marava-Chatzinicolaou and C. Toufexi-Paschou, *Catalogue of the Illumina- ted Byzantine Manuscripts of the National Library of Greece, I: Manuscripts of New Testament Texts, Tenth Through Twelfth Century* (Athens, 1978), no. 7, p. 50.

⁵⁴ I. Spatharakis, «Ένα εἰκονογραφημένο χειρόγραφο τοῦ 1175 ἀπὸ τὴν Κρήτη,» in *Θησαυρολόγια* 14 (1977): 71-75.

vered by nuns who seem to have had little idea what to do with it.⁵⁵ The evidence of the books themselves, then, is as ambivalent as that of the *typika* and biographical works. While the level of literacy among women cannot have been negligible, the production and accumulation of books by their institutions is scarcely documented.

The subject of women and monasticism, accordingly, poses a dilemma for the historian of women's art. The women who have appeared in surviving works — Maria, Eirene, Anna, Theodora Rhaoulina — do so in accord with patterns known from western Europe. Yet the impression that they produce is quite different. Only one of them — Eirene — can be regarded as a calligrapher, as such. The others are learned women who practiced a scholarly hand. To the extent that we know them, women of this sort seem to have acquired the habit of a learned life before entering a convent. The *typika* even of intellectually accomplished women like Eirene Doukaina or Eirene-Eulogia Choumnaina contain no formal provision for intellectual pursuits, and there is no evidence at all of a convent serving as the setting for a shop of calligraphers of professional calibre. While Eirene Doukaina's *typikon* intimates that needlework was cultivated in her convent, it is hard to know whether this would have included the highly skilled activity of fine embroidery. Johnstone suggests that the very high level of professional competence needed to produce gold embroidery would rather imply professional workshops.⁵⁶ The case for books is equally difficult to assess. The majority of documented scribes in Byzantium are monastic.⁵⁷ Yet women's institutions offer little insight into the woman as book producer. The Byzantine convent does not create so clear a context for women as book producers as the western convent does.

⁵⁵ Volk (as in note 48), p. 92.

⁵⁶ Johnstone (as in note 17), pp. 57-58.

⁵⁷ One gathers this from a statistical tally of names in Vogel and Gardthausen (as in note 19). In the Middle Byzantine period the monastic scribe is very noticeably in the majority; the proportion of monastic scribes is lower in the Palaeologan period. Anthony Cutler is preparing a study of the status of Byzantine scribes on the basis of Vogel and Gardthausen's listing.

Our understanding of the Byzantine book trade itself is imperfect as yet. We do not know where the equipment for book production can most logically be assumed to have been found, or how this shifted over time. It does seem clear that the production of books cannot consistently be explained in terms of the integrated scriptorium, in which scribes and painters were disciplined to turn out uniform products. A looser, more entrepreneurial pattern seems to have been at work in many cases from the eleventh century onward. Wendel, on the basis of Theodore Hagiopetrites's example, assembles evidence to suggest a more considerable lay component than is usually imagined in the production of books,⁵⁸ and this seems to be corroborated by art historical data. At least, Pantoleon, if he was, indeed, the miniaturist of Vatican, Graecus 1613, was no monk,⁵⁹ and the painters of Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, grec 74 seem to have worked for a range of patrons so broad that they may best be imagined as out-and-out professionals.⁶⁰ Lay scribes and painters may have worked out of monasteries, as Wendel proposes; especially in cities, on the other hand, they may have worked out of the home in accord with the strongly cottage-industrial character of Byzantine commerce.⁶¹ Such variables would certainly have implications for the woman scribe and illuminator. The likelihood of women's participation in a cottage-industrial trade would be high; similarly, their anonymity would be usual in such a context, where the shop owner's name would be the only one cited, if at all, and names of any sort would be rare outside of contracts. The patterns

⁵⁸ Wendel (as in note 9), pp. 265-66.

⁵⁹ Ševčenko, «On Pantoleon the Painter» (as in note 9).

⁶⁰ Works attributed to them range from London, B.L., add. 19352, a monastic work, through the model of London, B.L., add. 39627, which probably had imperial portraits as its later copy does, to the various other variants of Paris, B.N., gr 74, which must have been individual commissions from institutions or private patrons.

⁶¹ Kazhdan (as in note 29), p. 24.

of Byzantine book production as they emerge will surely help to cast light on the role of women. But the converse is also true. As the case of Theodore Hagiopetrites's daughter, Eirene, has already shown,⁶² the women who emerge as book producers will help in their turn to illumine the contexts in which books were made.

The role of women in Byzantine art, then, leads very quickly to the most basic questions of social and economic order in the Empire. It draws attention to the way in which highly skilled trades were nurtured in Byzantium, and the balance of lay and monastic workshops in maintaining them. It turns attention to the documented patterns of book production. And it turns attention to the character of women's monasticism: the needs it filled, the activities it encouraged, and the ways it altered over time. It is to the latter questions that the ensuing papers are addressed. The art historian is clearly not alone in welcoming their insights.

⁶² Wendel (as in note 9), p. 265.

AUTHORITY AND HUMILITY: A CONFLICT OF VALUES IN FOURTH-CENTURY FEMALE MONASTICISM

ELIZABETH A. CLARK / DURHAM, N.C.

That humility was of central importance to the Christian life is made abundantly clear in the New Testament.¹ Yet the first generations of Christians, if not the impoverished outcasts imagined by earlier scholars,² nonetheless included few if any aristocrats for whom humility might be an unfamiliar virtue.³ By about A.D. 200,

¹ For example, Matthew 5:3; 18:1-5; 20:26-28; 23:11-12; Mark 9:33-37; 10:15, 43-45; Luke 1:38, 52; 14:7-14; 18:9-14; 22:27; Acts 20:19; Romans 12:16; Ephesians 4:2; Colossians 3:12; James 1:9-10; 4:6; I Peter 5:5-6.

² See discussions and reassessments in E.A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century* (London, 1960), chap. 5; Martin Hengel, *Property and Riches in the Early Church*, trans. J. Bowden (London, 1974), 27-37; Gerd Theissen, "Soziale Schichtung in der korinthischen Gemeinde," *ZNW*, 65 (1974), 232-272; Gerd Theissen, "Die Starken und Schwachen in Korinth," *Evth*, 35 (1975), 155-172; Abraham Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge, London, 1977), 8-9, 29-41; L. William Countryman, *The Rich Christian in the Church of the Early Empire: Contradictions and Accommodations* (New York, Toronto, 1980), 1-18.

³ The editor of Acts is especially concerned to represent Christianity as appealing to the powerful or at least not outrightly condemned by them. See, for example, Acts 13:7-12; 18:12-17; 24-26, and comments by Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, trans. B. Noble et al. (Philadelphia, 1971), 403, 658-659, 663, 670, 674, 679, 691-692.

however, Clement of Alexandria knew Christians sufficiently wealthy to be troubled by Jesus' counsel to sell our goods for the sake of the poor,⁴ and in the fourth century the conversion of the monied aristocrats began in earnest.⁵ Not least among the patrician converts to ascetic Christianity were women who renounced their societal roles in order to found and direct monasteries for females. That both their noble backgrounds and their authoritative leadership of monasteries might militate against the humility they as female Christian ascetics should espouse is obvious.⁶ The evidence provided about the women by the Church Fathers does indeed suggest that the potential conflict of humility and authority called for a skillful resolution, in literature as well as in life.

Is not the Fathers' extravagant praise for the humility of their female subjects, when coupled with their deafening silence regarding the women's authoritative leadership, paradoxical? Why should the women's humility be accorded such honor when their leadership in founding and directing monasteries receives practically no mention? It is evident that humility must in fact be cultivated if

⁴ Clement of Alexandria, *Quis Dives Salvetur?*, ed. O. Stählin, GCS 17 (Leipzig, 1909), 157-191; the treatise is a commentary on the story of the rich young man in Mark 10:17-32 = Matthew 19:16-30 = Luke 18:18-30.

⁵ André Chastagnol, "Le Sénateur Volusien et la conversion d'une famille de l'aristocratie romaine au Bas-Empire," *REA*, 58 (1956), 241-253; Peter Brown, "Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy," *JRS*, 51 (1961), 1-11 (= *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine* [New York, 1971], 161-182); A.H.M. Jones, "The Social Background of the Struggle between Paganism and Christianity," in A. Momigliano, *Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 1963), 17-37; Charles Pietri, "Esquisse de conclusion: l'aristocratie chrétienne entre Jean de Constantinople et Augustin d'Hippone," *Jean Chrysostome et Augustin*, actes du colloque de Chantilly, 22-24 septembre 1974, ed. C. Kannengiesser (Paris, 1975), 283-305; Anne Yarbrough, "Christianization in the Fourth Century: The Example of Roman Women," *ChH*, 45 (1976), 149-165.

⁶ For an analysis of the status elevation the Fathers accorded these aristocratic ascetics, see Elizabeth Clark, "Ascetic Renunciation and Feminine Advancement," *AthR*, 63 (1981), 240-257.

aristocratic nuns were to live together amicably with those from the lowest social classes in monastic seclusion: that theme punctuates two early monastic Rules composed especially for women, Augustine's *Epistle* 211 and Caesarius of Arles' *Rule for Nuns*.⁷ We may also take for granted that the Fathers wished to represent their admired female friends as conforming to such Biblical injunctions as I Timothy 2:11-15 that enjoined women to be silent and submissive. Yet something more appears to be at issue in the exaltation of the women's humility and the neglect of their authority that prompts a re-examination of the sources pertaining to their monastic leadership.

The three fourth-century women serving as subjects for the investigation founded monasteries for females in the East: Olympias, confidante of John Chrysostom; Melania the Elder, monastic companion of Rufinus of Aquileia; and Paula, the friend of Jerome.⁸ Their life patterns are remarkably similar. Each was a wealthy aristocrat who, when prematurely widowed, devoted her energies as well as her fortune to the founding and directing of a monastery. Although contemporary documents tell less about the women's supervision of monasteries than about their Christian virtues, the evidence nonetheless enables us to locate the type of authority they wielded and to hypothesize why that authority was not openly lauded in the sources.

Olympias' grandfather Ablabius, although reputedly of undistinguished background,⁹ was praetorian prefect of Constantinople

⁷ Augustine, *Ep.* 211, 5-6, ed. A. Goldbacher, CSEL 57 (Vienna, Leipzig, 1911), 359-361; Caesarius of Arles, *Regula Sanctorum Virginum* 21, ed. G. Morin (Bonn, 1933), 9.

⁸ Macrina, sister of Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa, and the fifth-century Melania the Younger are other monastic founders whose careers bear study.

⁹ Libanius, *Oratio* 42, 33, ed. R. Foerster (Leipzig, 1906), III, 318; Eunapius, *Vitae Sophistarum* 463, ed. W.C. Wright (London, New York, 1922), 384.

and served as consul in A.D. 331.¹⁰ Her father ranked among the *comites* and her husband of brief duration, Nebridius, served as prefect of Constantinople in A.D. 386.¹¹ When she was widowed at twenty, Olympias was so prized as a potential mate that Theodosius I attempted to force her into marriage with one of his relatives.¹² Resisting both his threats and his enticements, Olympias vowed herself to Christian celibacy and was ordained a deaconess in the early 390s.¹³ Her financial contributions to the church of Constantinople were stunning: "Ten thousand pounds of gold, twenty thousand of silver, all her real estate in Thrace, Galatia, Cappadocia Prima, and Bithynia," in addition to several houses in the Eastern capital and its suburbs.¹⁴ Both Palladius and the anonymous author of her *Vita*¹⁵ report that she "maintained" John Chrysostom as bishop of Constantinople, as she had done his predecessor, Nestorius.¹⁶ Even after Chrysostom's exile, Olympias supplied him with money to provide for the needs of his retinue, to redeem

¹⁰ *Vita Olympiadis* 2, ed. A.-M. Malingrey, SC 13 bis (Paris, 1968), 408; Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 56, ed. C. Butler (Cambridge, 1904), II, 150; A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, Vol. I: A.D. 260-395* (Cambridge, 1971) 3-4.

¹¹ *Vita Olympiadis* 2, ed. Malingrey, 408, 410; Jones et al., *Prosopography*, I, 818-819, 620; Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 56, ed. Butler, II, 150; Palladius, *Dialogus de Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi* 56, ed. P.R. Coleman-Norton (Cambridge, 1928), 98.

¹² *Vita Olympiadis* 3, ed. Malingrey, 410, 412; Palladius, *Dialogus* 60, ed. Coleman-Norton, 106-108.

¹³ *Vita Olympiadis* 3-6, ed. Malingrey, 412, 414, 416, 418, 420; Palladius, *Dialogus* 56; 60, ed. Coleman-Norton, 98, 108-109; Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VIII, 9, 1, ed. J. Bidez and G.C. Hansen, GSC 50 (Berlin, 1960), 361.

¹⁴ *Vita Olympiadis* 5, ed. Malingrey, 416.

¹⁵ Perhaps Heraclides, bishop of Nyssa around A.D. 440: so Ernst Honigmann, *Patristic Studies*, ST 173 (Vatican City, 1953), 106, 113-116.

¹⁶ Palladius, *Dialogus* 61, ed. Coleman-Norton, 109-110; *Vita Olympiadis* 7; 8; 14, ed. Malingrey, 420, 422, 436.

captives, to assist the poor.¹⁷ Visiting clergy also benefited from Olympias' largesse: she opened a house for their use in Constantinople and furnished them with funds.¹⁸

Most important, Olympias erected a monastery for females near the Constantinople cathedral and enrolled about 250 women in it, of whom fifty were her own servants and four her own relatives (the latter were required to make over their possessions to the convent before they were granted admission).¹⁹ Since in Raymond Janin's judgment the first orthodox monastery for men in the city cannot be dated before A.D. 382 and the first women's monastery was most likely founded near the end of the fourth century,²⁰ it is safe to assume that Olympias' community was among the earliest such institutions for women in the Eastern capital. The sources reveal little, however, about Olympias' direction of her convent. Instead, much is reported about her Christian virtues: that she had no vanity or conceit,²¹ that she revered members of the clergy,²² that she spent her life in tears of repentance.²³ Chrysostom in his seventeen extant letters to Olympias from exile stresses how remarkable her

¹⁷ *Vita Olympiadis* 8; 14, ed. Malingrey, 422, 436; Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VIII, 27, 8, ed. Bidez and Hansen, 388.

¹⁸ *Vita Olympiadis* 14, ed. Malingrey 436, 438; Palladius, *Dialogus* 56-57; 61, ed. Coleman-Norton, 99-102, 110; John Chrysostom, *Epistulae ad Olympiadem* 8 (= Migne 2), 10a, ed. A.-M. Malingrey, SC 13 bis (Paris, 1968), 198.

¹⁹ *Vita Olympiadis* 6, ed. Malingrey, 418; see also Raymond Janin, *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin. I, 3: Les Eglises et les monastères* (Paris, 1953), 395-396.

²⁰ Janin, *Eglises*, 3-4.

²¹ *Vita Olympiadis* 13, ed. Malingrey, 434; John Chrysostom, *Epistulae ad Olympiadem* 15, 15, 1a; 8 (= Migne 2), 5c-d; 9c, ed. Malingrey, 356, 178, 196.

²² *Vita Olympiadis* 14; 15, ed. Malingrey, 436, 438, 440; Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 56, ed. Butler, II, 150.

²³ *Vita Olympiadis* 15, ed. Malingrey, 440.

ascetic practices were, given her luxuriously soft upbringing.²⁴ Her patience in suffering, he writes, is “the queen of goods, the most beautiful of crowns.”²⁵ To enumerate her good deeds would be as futile as to count the waves of the sea.²⁶ Chrysostom’s adulation of Olympias often strains the limits of the modern reader’s trust, fashioned as it is in accordance with the extravagances of late ancient rhetoric. Yet Chrysostom relates not a single word about Olympias as founder and director of the Constantinople monastery. Indeed, his picture of the modest, retiring Olympias does not entirely square with the notices in other sources that she was courageous enough to defy the wills of an emperor and a city prefect.²⁷

The case of Melania the Elder is likewise puzzling. Daughter and granddaughter of Roman consuls, a member of the distinguished gens Antonia, Melania was widowed at an early age.²⁸ Leaving Rome in the 370s, she journeyed to the East and founded monasteries for men and women on the Mount of Olives in A.D. 378 or 380, paid for from her own considerable fortune.²⁹ Her companion Rufinus of Aquileia took charge of the men’s monastery and Melania, the one for females. Yet neither Rufinus nor her friends Palladius and Paulinus of Nola (who was also her cousin)³⁰ describe the monasteries she organized; Palladius merely remarks in passing

²⁴ John Chrysostom, *Epistulae ad Olympiadem* 8 (= Migne 2), 5c, ed. Malingrey, 176, 178.

²⁵ John Chrysostom, *Epistulae ad Olympiadem* 17 (= Migne 4), 2a, ed. Malingrey, 372.

²⁶ John Chrysostom, *Epistulae ad Olympiadem* 8 (= Migne 2), 5d, ed. Malingrey, 178.

²⁷ *Vita Olympiadis* 3-4, ed. Malingrey 410, 412, 414; Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* VIII, 24, 4-7, ed. Bidez and Hansen, 382.

²⁸ Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 46, ed. Butler, II, 134; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 29, 8, ed. W. von Hartel, CSEL 29 (Prague, Vienna, Leipzig, 1894), 253-254; Jones, et al., *Prosopography*, I, 592-593.

²⁹ Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 46; 54, ed. Butler, II, 135-136, 147-148; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 29, 10, ed. Hartel, 257.

³⁰ Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 29, 5, ed. Hartel, 251.

that the community for women housed fifty virgins.³¹ Although Melania's charitable³² and courageous³³ deeds, self-imposed poverty,³⁴ and extreme ascetic practices³⁵ are frequently mentioned, Palladius and Paulinus disclose nothing about her role as monastic leader, even though she provided the funds for her monastery and left money to endow it when she died.³⁶

Melania was not the only fourth-century member of the Roman nobility to found a monastery for women in the Holy Land: Jerome's friend Paula did the same in Bethlehem. In his encomium of Paula, *Epistle* 108, Jerome dwells upon her aristocratic background: she was descended from the Scipios, the Gracchi, and Agamemnon, while her husband Julius Toxotius had the blood of Aeneas in his veins.³⁷ When Toxotius died, Paula remained in Rome for five years, practicing home asceticism in her own palace.³⁸ In A.D. 385, she left Rome for the East, accompanied by her daughter Eustochium and her female servants.³⁹ After an ex-

³¹ Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 46, ed. Butler, II, 135.

³² Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 10; 46; 54, ed. Butler, II, 30, 136, 146, 147-148; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 29, 11, ed. Hartel, 257-258.

³³ Melania provides refuge for fugitives from Arian persecution and intimidates a Palestinian judge who attempts to convict her: Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 29, 11, ed. Hartel, 257-258; Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 46, ed. Butler, II, 134-135.

³⁴ Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 54, ed. Butler, II, 146; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 29, 12, ed. Hartel, 259-260.

³⁵ Melania did not wash: see Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 55, ed. Butler, II, 148-149 (a passage now thought to concern Melania). Her couch was the ground, according to Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 29, 13, ed. Hartel, 260.

³⁶ Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 54, ed. Butler, II, 148.

³⁷ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 1; 3; 4, ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL 55 (Vienna, Leipzig, 1912), 306, 308, 309.

³⁸ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 5; 34, ed. Hilberg 310, 351.

³⁹ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 6; 11; 14, ed. Hilberg, 310-312, 320, 325.

tended tour of Egypt and the Holy Land, she settled in Bethlehem where she built monasteries for both sexes, superintending the women's community herself.⁴⁰ So numerous were the women who flocked to her convent that Paula divided them into three companies. Jerome's description implies that the division may have been made on the basis of social class: he says of the women that there were "tam nobiles quam medii et infimi generis."⁴¹ Although Jerome praises the women's work in making garments for themselves and others,⁴² it does not appear that their labor supplied the funds by which the monastery was maintained. One of the several testimonies to this fact lies in Jerome's comment, after Paula's death, to her daughter and successor Eustochium that now she would have "crowds of brothers and sisters" to support; however heavy the burden, it would be "inpius" to cast off the monks and nuns dependent upon her.⁴³ His words indicate that the money for the monasteries' operation had indeed been supplied by Paula.

Just as with Olympias and Melania, so with Paula are humility and self-sacrifice more praised than leadership. Jerome reports that she cultivated lowliness, shunned glory.⁴⁴ During her visit to Egypt, she protested that the desert fathers received her with too much honor.⁴⁵ "Humility is the first virtue of Christians," Jerome writes of Paula, "and so great was the humility by which she cast herself down that those who had seen her, and those who wanted to see her because of her celebrated reputation, would not have believed that it was she, but the lowliest of her servant women."⁴⁶ Her lowliness, not her competent direction of a monastery, is clearly Jerome's chief concern.

⁴⁰ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 7-14; 20, ed. Hilberg, 312-325, 334-335.

⁴¹ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 20, ed. Hilberg, 334-335.

⁴² Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 20, ed. Hilberg, 335.

⁴³ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 30, ed. Hilberg, 348.

⁴⁴ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 3, ed. Hilberg, 308-309.

⁴⁵ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 14, ed. Hilberg, 324.

⁴⁶ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 15, ed. Hilberg, 325.

One possible explanation for why the Fathers did not dwell on the women as monastic leaders was that the authority they exercised was based neither on the offices they held nor on the functions they performed, but on their personal status. Max Weber's typology of authority is here useful to the discussion. These three monastic directors wielded, in Weber's terminology, a traditional type of authority, indeed a patriarchally traditional one.⁴⁷ Their authority cannot be characterized either as Weber's rational / legal type in which generalized, impersonal rules prevail and a clear-cut separation exists between the official and the private spheres,⁴⁸ or as the charismatic type Weber most frequently ascribes to founders of religious movements.⁴⁹ To be sure, as "ascetic virtuosi,"⁵⁰ Olympias, Melania the Elder, and Paula possessed a certain charisma derived from their awesome renunciations, but their source of authority as monastic leaders did not rest primarily on their followers' perception of them as possessors of special divinely-granted powers.⁵¹ Even though the women's breaking of societal norms in their decision for asceticism can scarcely be labeled traditional,⁵² the type of authority they possessed can: it was derived from their own monied and aristocratic backgrounds.

⁴⁷ Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, ed. G. Roth and C. Wittich, trans. E. Fischhoff et al. (New York, 1968), I, 231; III, 1006-1008.

⁴⁸ Weber, *Economy*, I, 215, 217; explicated by Talcott Parsons in Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. A.M. Henderson and T. Parsons (New York, London, 1947), 57-67.

⁴⁹ Weber, *Economy*, I, 241-245, III, 1111-1120. For a summary of recent criticism of Weber's notion of charismatic authority, see Bengt Holmberg, *Paul and Power; The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles* (Lund, 1978), chap. 5.

⁵⁰ Weber, *Economy*, I, 245; III, 1170.

⁵¹ Charisma is attributed, not "individual psychological equipment": Holmberg, *Paul*, 176.

⁵² Their revolutionary break from societal expectations would be more characteristic of Weber's charismatic authority; see Weber, *Economy*, I, 244-245.

Several characteristics of traditional authority as outlined by Weber seem especially relevant to the analysis. First, traditional authority does not clearly distinguish between the private and the public roles of the leader: his or her status is “total.”⁵³ Traditional authority here sharply contrasts with rational / legal authority in which a manifest separation of the public and private spheres exists.⁵⁴ Also unlike rational / legal authority is a second, correlative characteristic of traditional authority, especially the patriarchally traditional type: it makes little or no distinction between the leader’s own property and the property of the group.⁵⁵ The leader, for example, equips his retainers,⁵⁶ shares his house, food, and drink with them.⁵⁷ Third, in traditional authority the leader’s assistants and close followers are usually persons whose loyalty is based on their status as relatives, slaves, or other dependents.⁵⁸ The obedience the leader commands thus corresponds closely to a form of filial piety, posits Weber.⁵⁹ Fourth, patriarchally traditional authority tends to provide for succession of leadership by inheritance within the kinship group,⁶⁰ rather than by election or appointment on grounds of merit. Fifth, traditional authority is not likely to

⁵³ Implicit in Weber, *Economy*, I, 226-241; contrasted with rational/legal authority, I, 219; explicitly developed by Parsons, in Weber, *Theory*, 58, 61.

⁵⁴ Weber, *Economy*, I, 218-223.

⁵⁵ Weber, *Economy*, I, 219.

⁵⁶ Weber, *Economy*, I, 230.

⁵⁷ Weber, *Economy*, III, 1008.

⁵⁸ Weber, *Economy*, I, 227-228, 230; III, 1006; a characteristic similar to charismatic authority, III, 1122.

⁵⁹ Weber, *Economy*, III, 1007.

⁶⁰ Weber, *Economy*, I, 231.

operate through a set of impersonal, written rules, as does rational / legal authority, even though such rules may exist.⁶¹

These five characteristics are prominent in descriptions of the women and monasteries here considered. All three monasteries were not only founded but also funded by the women who became their superiors. The monasteries' property was in essence *their* property: they had purchased it, erected the monastic buildings. Indeed, it can be posited that the women's ownership and control of the monastic property was the decisive determinant of their authority. This economic factor clearly distinguishes the women's patriarchally traditionalist authority from authority held by charismatic endowment. Weber is unequivocal in his insistence that charismatic authority "recognizes no appropriation of positions of power by virtue of the possession of property, either on the part of a chief or of socially privileged groups."⁶² Olympias, Melania the Elder, and Paula, by contrast, fail to exemplify the "anti-economic" tendency Weber associates with early charismatic monasticism,⁶³ whose practitioners lived either from gifts or by begging.⁶⁴ Despite the fact that the communities of these women were among the earliest we know outside of Egypt and hence theoretically could be expected to conform more closely to Weber's ideal type than later monasteries, such an expectation is not confirmed by the sources: the monasteries were supported by the women's inherited wealth. In this as in other ways, the Latin aristocratic ascetics deviate from what is commonly assumed to be the norm of early Christian asceticism.⁶⁵

⁶¹ Weber, *Economy*, I, 219, 227, 231; III, 1006; explicated by Parsons, in Weber, *Theory*, 60-61.

⁶² Weber, *Economy*, I, 244.

⁶³ Weber, *Economy*, III, 1168.

⁶⁴ Weber, *Economy*, I, 244-245.

⁶⁵ For other deviations, see Clark, "Ascetic Renunciation," *passim*.

As for the composition of the original group of nuns in the women's monasteries, the relatives and servants of Paula and Olympias who followed them into ascetic retreat formed the nucleus of the monastic establishment.⁶⁶ Loyalty would hence continue to be granted on a personal basis to the former mistress or relative, not to an impersonal order. Concerning the succession of leadership in the convents, it is also clear that Paula's and Olympias' kin inherited the founder's authority over the monasteries. Jerome reports that Paula's daughter Eustochium succeeded her as director,⁶⁷ and the *Vita Melaniae Junioris* provides evidence that Paula's granddaughter and namesake continued in the third generation as the head of the Bethlehem convent.⁶⁸ As for Olympias' monastery, the *Vita Olympiadis* plainly states that its next two mother superiors, Marina and Elisanthia, were the founder's own relatives.⁶⁹ The traditional pattern of succession by inheritance⁷⁰ apparently obtained in these two convents as long as the ascetic lifestyle permitted.

The fifth characteristic, that traditional authority, unlike rational/legal authority,⁷¹ does not tend to operate through written rules, deserves a more extended consideration. Weber posits that although such rules may exist in situations of traditional authority, it is the personal status of the leader that is determinative.⁷² This is

⁶⁶ *Vita Olympiadis* 6; 15, ed. Malingrey, 418, 440; Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 11; 14, ed. Hilberg, 320, 325.

⁶⁷ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, .15; 30, ed. Hilberg, 327, 348-349.

⁶⁸ *Vita Melaniae Junioris* 68, ed. Gorce, SC 90 (Paris, 1962), 264: Paula arrives at Melania the Younger's deathbed "with all her household." In *Vita Melaniae Junioris* 63, ed. Gorce, 254, Melania and Paula celebrate the Nativity in Bethlehem. The younger Paula was the daughter of the elder Paula's son Toxotius and his wife Laeta.

⁶⁹ *Vita Olympiadis* 6-7; 10; 12, ed. Malingrey, 418, 420, 426, 432, 434.

⁷⁰ Weber, *Economy*, I, 231; explicated by Parsons in Weber, *Theory*, 61-62.

⁷¹ Weber, *Economy*, I, 219; explicated by Parsons in Weber, *Theory*, 57-58.

⁷² Weber, *Economy*, I, 227; explicated by Parsons in Weber, *Theory*, 60-61.

precisely the case for the three monasteries under consideration: regulations of some sort were in effect, possibly written ones, but they are not appealed to in the sources as empowering the monastic directors. Some regulatory principles must have sustained the monasteries, as they do all institutions, especially as women joined who were not the foundresses' relatives and former servants, and who hence could not necessarily be expected to accord their superior the filial obedience characteristic of traditional authority. The original principle of authority must somehow be modified to allow for the changing situation: in Weber's phrase, "routinization" must take place. Although Weber uses the word "routinization" to describe the process by which *charismatic* leadership becomes stabilized,⁷³ it is an apt term with which to describe the process by which leadership is perpetuated when the original situation of traditional authority no longer obtains. In the case of monasticism, one important manifestation of "routinization" would be the adoption of and adherence to a Rule, a standard authority apart from the person of the monastic founder. Hence the evidence pertaining to the use of monastic Rules in the sources under discussion is germane to the analysis of women's monastic leadership. The evidence suggests that Rules were indeed present early in the monasteries' histories, but that they were not seen as determining the authority of the original foundresses.

The *Vita Olympiadis*, for example, reports that Marina, the next director of the convent after Olympias, "performed and fulfilled" that which had been entrusted to her by Olympias, "preserving safe and governing the whole caravan of her flock."⁷⁴ The fourteenth-century Byzantine historiographer Nicephorus Callistus adds the more precise note that Marina was entrusted to observe τὸν τοῦ μοναστηρίου κανόνα.⁷⁵ And Elisanthia, the second mother superior after Olympias, "preserved unchanged the entire Rule she had received from that pious and blessed soul," according to the *Vita*

⁷³ Weber, *Economy*, I, 246-254; III, 1121-1123.

⁷⁴ *Vita Olympiadis* 12, ed. Malingrey, 432.

⁷⁵ Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiasticae Historiae* XII, 24, PG 146, 1013.

Olympiadis.⁷⁶ The Rule is again mentioned in an account relating to the transfer of Olympias' bones, composed by Sergia, director of Olympias' convent in the 630s. Sergia states that "Olympias' Rule" had remained in effect until the convent burned during the Nika rebellion of A.D. 532.⁷⁷ When the convent was rebuilt, the Rule was presumably adopted again, for Sergia concludes her *Narratio* with the pious wish that the Rule transmitted down to her time will be observed in the future.⁷⁸ What this Rule was, we do not know. There is no mention of its content in any known source pertaining to Olympias. Although it may well have been in effect during her lifetime, it was not the factor determining her authority.

From the sources we have considered pertaining to Paula and Melania the Elder, even less can be gleaned about possible Rules existing in their monasteries. Yet supplementary documents suggest that the monasteries may indeed have had Rules. Neither Rufinus, nor Palladius, nor Paulinus — the three men who wrote the most about Melania — mentions that Melania governed her nuns through a Rule. Yet it was Rufinus who translated Basil of Caesarea's Rules into Latin, conflating the two Rules into one.⁷⁹ Although the translation was not made until Rufinus returned West in A.D. 397,⁸⁰ it is likely that he knew them at an earlier date.

⁷⁶ *Vita Olympiadis* 12, ed. Malingrey, 432, 434.

⁷⁷ Sergia, *Narratio de translatione S. Olympiadis* 2, ed. Delehaye, *AnalBoll*, 16 (1897), 44.

⁷⁸ Sergia, *Narratio* 14, ed. Delehaye, 51.

⁷⁹ Latin translation in PL 103, 485-554. See also Francis X. Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia (345-411): His Life and Works* (Washington, D.C., 1945), 50 n. 86, 63, 89-91; Ferdinand Laun, "Die beiden Regeln des Basilii, ihre Echtheit und Entstehung," *ZKircheng*, 44 (1925), 10-29.

⁸⁰ Rufinus, *Praefatio ad Regulam S. Basilii*, PL 103, 485-486; for Rufinus' return to the West in A.D. 397, see Murphy, *Rufinus*, 50 n. 86; C.P. Hammond, "The Last Ten Years of Rufinus' Life and the Date of His Move South from Aquileia," *JThS*, n.s., 28 (1977), 384; Nicole Moine, "Melaniana," *RAug*, 15 (1980), 31.

Indeed, the Rufinus scholar Francis X. Murphy earlier posited that Basil's Rules were in fact used in Rufinus' and Melania's monasteries.⁸¹

Melania may have received advice on running a monastery from another source as well: Evagrius Ponticus, the famous Origenist theoretician of asceticism whom Melania had rescued for the ascetic life,⁸² wrote a work often called, in translation, "The Mirror for Nuns."⁸³ That title, however, is inexact in more than one respect: the Greek title, Παράινεσις πρὸς παρθένον, indicates that it is *one* nun who is addressed. Is it not likely, as Joseph Muyldermans has argued, that the παρθένος to whom the work was directed was Evagrius' old friend, Melania the Elder?⁸⁴ Muyldermans' suggestion is strengthened by the additional information that it was none other than Rufinus himself who translated the work into Latin.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, it is clear that even if Melania did have a monastic Rule for her community, the men who wrote about her did not deem her leadership to be grounded in such a Rule, for they mention it not once.

The evidence pertaining to Paula's monastery is similar. Jerome

⁸¹ Murphy, *Rufinus*, 70.

⁸² Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 38, ed. Butler, II, 119-120.

⁸³ Greek text edited by Hugo Gressmann in *TU* 39, 4 (Leipzig, 1913), 146-151.

⁸⁴ Joseph Muyldermans, ed. and trans., *Evagriana Syriaca. Textes inédits du British Museum et de la Vaticane* (Louvain, 1952), 30.

⁸⁵ For clues that Rufinus translated Evagrius' *Rule for Nuns*, see Jerome, *Ep.* 133, 3, ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL 56 (Vienna, Leipzig, 1918), 246-247; Gennadius, *De viris illustribus* 17, PG 58, 1070; D.A. Wilmart, "Les Versions latines des Sentences d'Evagre pour les vierges," *RBén*, 28 (1911), 143-144, 148-151.

in *Epistle* 108 briefly describes the operation of Paula's Bethlehem community and from his words we infer that regulations of some sort were in effect there. He reports, for example, that disobedient nuns were excluded from the common refectory, that meat was allowed only to the sick, that the nuns all dressed alike.⁸⁶ But *what* Rule may have undergirt such regulations is never revealed. We do know, however, that it was Jerome who translated Pachomius' Rule from its Greek version into Latin, and he testifies that he did so explicitly for Eustochium's use in governing the sisters of the Bethlehem convent.⁸⁷ It is not inconceivable that some provisions of the Egyptian Rule were upheld in Paula's community even during her lifetime. Indeed, when Jerome implies that the ascetic life practiced by Rufinus and Melania the Elder in Jerusalem was not as rigorous as that practiced at Bethlehem (Jerome calls Rufinus a Croesus, a Crassus, a Sardanapalus),⁸⁸ we might conclude that the Bethlehem contingent favored the more severe Egyptian practices over the milder ones of Basil's Rule⁸⁹ — although the venom Jerome spews forth at Rufinus probably discredits his testimony about him.

The authority wielded by these female monastic founders, then, does not appear to have been dependent upon their offices or upon Rules, as is characteristic of rational / legal authority. Their leadership derived ultimately from their family wealth and status. Perhaps this is one reason why the Fathers did not think to mention the offices the women held, how they carried out their duties as superiors of convents, or from what Rules they derived their authority — questions that we who live in a world regulated largely by

⁸⁶ Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 20, ed. Hilberg, 335-336.

⁸⁷ Jerome, *Praefatio*, *S. Pachomii Regula*, 1, ed. A. Boon (Louvain, 1932), 3-5.

⁸⁸ Jerome, *Apologia contra Rufinum* I, 17, PL 23, 430; III, 4, PL 23, 480-481; *In Nahum* III, PL 25, 1261.

⁸⁹ Murphy, *Rufinus*, 61-62.

rational / legal authority would like answered. Those are questions of interest to our time, but apparently not to fourth- and fifth-century monastic writers. Rather, by their emphasis on the women's humility and abject lowliness, the Fathers were in effect highlighting, by way of contrast, the true source of authority the women possessed: status, family background, wealth. Blueness of blood implied a power that Rules, however painstakingly penned, would find difficult to match.

WOMEN'S MONASTICISM IN THE MIDDLE BYZANTINE PERIOD: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

DOROTHY DE F. ABRAHAMSE / LONG BEACH, CAL.

For anyone who has studied women in Byzantium or the medieval west, the problems inherent in analyzing female ascetic institutions in the middle Byzantine period are all too familiar. Nuns and convents are an accepted and even common feature of the ascetic landscape of the period. They are to be found in the background of most of the sources of the period as the mothers, sisters and clients of ascetic leaders, the daughters, widows or wives of disgraced or assassinated emperors (or, conversely, as the disgraced daughters and wives of successful emperors), occasional recipients of letters, donors of lands and owners of seals. We must assume from the context in which they appear that these references represent a larger invisible presence of women in the ascetic scene. But ascetic theory, canon law and monastic rules were almost never addressed to nuns, and only rarely are real women religious and their patrons described in sufficient detail to provide much information about their conventual life or its economic and social setting. From the scattered and clearly unrepresentative sources that do survive, we cannot make any reliable generalizations about the composition or endowment of the female ascetic establishment as a whole, nor is any quantitative analysis possible. But it is possible to delineate some distinctive types of foundations and to investigate the func-

tions of two — imperial foundations and convents associated with masculine ascetic leaders — which appear prominently in the sources for this era. Above all, this paper will argue, religious life for women must be understood in the light of three areas of inherent conflict between the expressed or implicit ideals for women religious and the real functions served by female communities in the mid-Byzantine society. An analysis of theory and practice in the extent of cloister, the relative authority of abbesses and masculine “spiritual directors” and the possibilities of ascetic vocation by choice certainly underlines, in large part, the restricted possibilities for women in religion in this era, but it also demonstrates some development of internal autonomy within their communities.

Let us begin by surveying convents and their founders in the extant sources. Despite the scattered nature of the evidence, it is possible to identify female foundations in some numbers in the middle Byzantine period. In Janin’s register of Constantinopolitan monasteries they form a significant proportion of the entries for the eighth, ninth, and tenth and eleventh centuries (ratios to male monasteries, based on a cautious reading of his list, of approximately 6:6, 10:25, 9:18, and 6:23).¹ We know very little about most of these names. Several are merely synaxarial references to convents where martyr’s memories were feted annually, others are

¹ Raymond Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l’empire byzantin I: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique*, t. 3: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 1953) (cited as Janin, 1953). The companion volume, Pt. I, t. 2: *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins* (Paris, 1974) (cited as Janin, 1974), has been used for individual monasteries, but because of its organization (limitation to major monastic centers, where women’s communities were generally not allowed), it gives too little indication of overall evidence available for any count. For the eleventh century this information may be supplemented by J. Darrouzès, “Le mouvement des fondations monastiques au xi siècle”, *Travaux et mémoires* 6, (Paris, 1976), 159-176, with recent bibliography and a catalogue of foundations, including provincial sites. New foundations only, however, are included. I have included in this very rough count those monasteries which are attested with reasonable probability for the first time in a given century. Problems in any such listing are the likelihood that references include monasteries known under different names, the uncertainty of foundations known only from synaxarial, hagiographical or patriarchal evidence, and the difficulty in assigning a definite mascu-

mentioned in saint's lives as repositories for the remains of saints or homes of the recipients of miracles.² By far the largest proportion (13) are associated, not surprisingly, with imperial families and known from chroniclers' references to the retirement, imprisonment or burial of female relatives in them. Thus, the two wives of Constantine VI retired to the monasteries they had founded, and the convents of Procopia, the Lady Euphrosyne and Gastrion were founded by empresses who were later enclosed in them.³ Despite the political circumstances that made these foundations worthy of mention for chroniclers, a tradition of foundation and patronage of ascetic communities for women by eighth and ninth century empresses may certainly be discerned — a pattern which had its eleventh century counterpart in the benefactions of Anna Dalasse-

line or feminine definition to communities identified only by name. The presumption used here has been that convents without further identification are masculine, but Janin's evidence for considering some foundations feminine suggests that other communities may well have been nunneries.

² Synaxarial references: Sosanna, Janin (1953), 496; *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, (AASS Prop. Nov., 1902), (cited as *Syn. Ecc. CP*) 57: Τελεῖται δὲ ἡ αὐτῆς μνήμη ἐν τῇ γυναικείᾳ μονῇ αὐτῆς τῇ οὔσῃ πλησίον τοῦ πατρικίου Θεοδοσίου. Hagiographical: Bardaines: Janin (1953), 62; *V. Symeonis novi theologi* [ed. I. Hausherr, *Orientalia Christiana* XII, (Rome, 1928), 2-228], 115. Monokionou: Janin (1953), 364; *V. Stephani junioris* (PG 100, 1067-1186), 1177; Chartophylakos (identical with Joannou), Janin (1953), p. 279, 517; *V. Basilii junioris*, (AASS Mart. III, 3rd ed., *2—*32) *31DE.

³ Isidorou (Theodote, wife of Constantine VI): Janin (1953), 271-272; Sathas, MB VII, 128. According to Sathas, the convent was transformed into a masculine monastery by Theophilos. Procopia (Procopia, wife of Michael I): Janin (1953), 458; Theoph. Cont. (Bonn) p. 20. Euphrosynes (Irene?): Janin (1953), 137-138; Preger III, 243; *De Cer.* II, 42 (Bonn, 647). Gastria (Theodora and daughters): Janin (1953), 72-73; Theoph. Cont. (Bonn) p. 90. Despoinon (Maria of Albania?): Janin (1953), 92-93; Sathas, MB VIII, 128. See also P. Grierson, "The Tombs and Obits of the Byzantine Emperors", (*DOP* 14, 1962, 1-60), p. 27, n. 85 and 55, n. 158. Grierson argues that Despoinon is identical with the convent of the Lady Euphrosyne.

na and Irene Dukaina.⁴ The background of other convents known only from the imperial relatives enclosed there is uncertain. Basil I may have founded the monastery of Euphemia in Petrio, where his daughters were placed; he certainly patronized it, and the convent retained its imperial connections later, when it received Zoe Carbinospina and (in 1031) Theodora, both in disgrace.⁵ Kanikleiou, where the weeping sisters of Romanos II were tonsured, Karianos, home for three of Michael III's sisters, Piperoudion, where Nicephorus Botaneiates confined his mother, and Despoton, place of imprisonment for the widow of Leo V, are otherwise unknown.⁶ We must assume that they were more than prisons.

Convents served the imperial families of the middle Byzantine period in another important way as mausolea and providers of funerary remembrance. It is not surprising to find exiled empresses buried in the convents in which they ended their days, but the practice of using convents or churches with women's communities attached to them as family burial places went beyond this. It is notable that the tombs of most of the imperial relatives of both sexes not included, for one reason or another, in the crowded mausolea at the church of the Holy Apostles were to be found in convents.⁷ Thus, the monastery of Gastria contained not only the remains of Theodora and her daughters, but of a niece, her brother Petronas, and the jawbone of the Caesar Bardas.⁸ Basil I buried

⁴ Theotokos tes Kecharitomenes: (Irene Dukaina): Janin (1953), 196-198; Typikon: Miklosich-Muller V, 327-391. A new edition of the *typikon* by Paul Gautier is forthcoming in *Révue des études byzantines*.

⁵ Euphemia in Petrio: Janin (1953), 134-135; Theoph. Cont. (Bonn) 264, 275, 397; Sym. Mag. (Bonn) 380, 473; Cedrenus (Bonn) II, 498.

⁶ Kanikleiou: Janin (1953), 286; Theoph. Cont. (Bonn) 380, 473; Zonaras (Bonn) XVIII, 21.

⁷ Grierson, "Tombs and Obits", pp. 7, 26-29, 55-58.

⁸ Ibid., p. 27, n. 58.

most of his family members in the nunnery in which he had placed his daughters (Euphemia in Petrio), and the tombs of Constantine VI, his wife Maria and their daughters were contained in the convent of the Lady Euphrosyne.⁹ When Romanos Lecapenos transformed his property of Myrelaion into a mausoleum for his wife (and, subsequently, not only his own remains and those of his family, but the transferred tombs of the emperor Maurice and his family), he made the foundation a convent.¹⁰ The practice of burial in nunneries was evidently not confined to imperial families, for the life of the eighth century lay saint Philaretos describes the saint's purchase of a tomb for himself and his wife from the abbess of the convent of St. Andrew in Krisei, and the life of Basil the Younger, another saint who did not live in a community of his own, describes his burial in a convent founded by his patron.¹¹ The liturgical remembrance of the dead was always a prime function of any monastic community, as the lists of commemorations ordained in *typika* demonstrate, but the attachment of mausolea to women's communities must have rendered their functions in the care and remembrance of the dead particularly important. It is a connection surely worthy of further investigation in the context of medieval funerary practices.¹²

⁹ Ibid., p. 55.

¹⁰ Myrelaion: Janin (1953), p. 364-355; Theoph. Cont. (Bonn) pp. 402, 473; Sym. Mag. (Bonn) p. 733; Geo. Mon. (Bonn) p. 894; Leo Gramm (Bonn) p. 307. Although there is some uncertainty whether the initial foundation included a convent, one was certainly there by the late tenth century.

¹¹ Andrew in Krisei: Janin (1953) 32; V. *Philareti eleemosynarii* [ed. M.H. Fourmy and M. Leroy, *Byzantion* 9 (1934), 113-167] p. 151: ...ἀνήλθεν εἰς τὸ μοναστήριον τὸ ἐπιλεγόμενον εἰς τὴν Κρίσην - καὶ Ῥοδοφύλιόν τινες αὐτὸ καλοῦσιν, παρθένοι δὲ σέμναι ἐν αὐτῷ οἰκοῦσι - αἰτήσας μνημεῖον παρὰ τῆς ἡγουμένης καὶ δοὺς αὐτῇ χρυσοῖον ἱκανόν, ἔλαβε παρ' αὐτῆς λάρνακον κένον... Joannou (Charophylakos): V. *Basilii jun* *31.

¹² There is no comprehensive study of memorials to the dead and funeral practices in Byzantine monasteries. For a brief description of funeral rites, see Margaret Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge, Eng., 1973), 24-35. Early Christian beliefs have been discussed most recently by Peter Brown in *The Cult of the Saints* (Chicago, 1980).

Imperial foundations were clearly not representative of the range of monasteries for women in Constantinople, but little else survives beyond the names of some patriarchal and aristocratic foundations.¹³ Evidence for the founders and patrons of provincial monasteries is even more elusive. To judge by the numbers of masculine saint's lives that begin their account of the hero's career with the breakup of the family and the placement of wives, mothers or sisters in local convents, and by the casual references to nuns in provincial saint's lives, female foundations should have been a familiar part of the landscape.¹⁴ Although little can be discovered of their organization or patronage, several convents are known to

¹³ Patriarchal foundations for women: Eremias (Photius): Janin (1953) 119; Leo Gramm (Bonn) 258; Geo. Mon. (Bonn) 844; Nikolaou (11th c.): Janin (1953) 387; Miklosich-Muller, V, 388; G. Anrich, *Hagios Nikolaos* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1913) I, 365-367. Eremias was a personal foundation of Photius on one of his own estates; Nikolaou is listed in the *typikon* of Irene Dukaina as a "patriarchal women's monastery" adjacent to her foundation. Aristocratic: Kloubios: Janin (1953) 292; V. *Joannicii a. Saba* (AASS Nov. II, 332-383) 33; *a. Petro* (AASS Nov. II, 384-435) 55-56. Nicetas Xylinites: Janin (1953) 393-394; Preger, III, 276; Leo Gramm. (Bonn) 257; Geo. Mon. (Bonn) 843. The foundation is certainly aristocratic; its identity as a female community depends on the somewhat dubious testimony of the patriographs. Lichoudes: Foundation of Constantine Lichoudes: Janin (1953) 316, Sathas, M IV, 4150416; V. *Euphrosynae junioris*, 42 (AASS Nov. III) 876D. The identity of the convent as female depends on the testimony of the life of Euphrosyne, a late 13th century text. Bardaines: V. *Sym. Nov. Theol.* 115 (See note 2) Bardas family.

¹⁴ Examples of saints' lives beginning with a family breakup: Theophanes Confessor, *Vita* by Methodios [ed. B. Latyšev, *Mémoires de l'Acad. imp. de St. Petersburg*, 8th series, 13, 4 (1918) 1-40], 21 (wife taken to nunnery on Prinkipos island); Peter of Argos: mother and sister join convents after older brother founds monastery [ed. Cozza-Luzzi in Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* (Rome, 1888) IV, 3, 1-17] Ch. 5. The biographer of Joannes Psichaites [ed. P. van den Ven, *Le Muséon* N.S. 3, (1902) 103-125] 3, claims that when the saint's father decided to enter monastic life with his sons, he left his wife and daughter in a local convent: 'Ο τοίνυν πατήρ τὸ ἀσθενὲς τῶν γυναιῶν σκοπήσας καὶ ὅτι οὐχ οἶαί τε ἦσαν συνέπεσθαι ἀνδράσιν, οὐδε γὰρ θέμις τοῦτο, ἐν ἀσκητηρίῳ ταύτας παρακαταθέμενος σὺν ᾧ ἐκέκτετο χωρίῳ...

have existed during this period in Thessalonica, second city of the empire.¹⁵ A few women's communities illuminated in greater detail through the lives of women saints will be discussed below, but one pattern of establishment is especially interesting in the light of mid-Byzantine ascetic thought. Despite the ethos of absolute separation of the sexes which produced, among ascetics of this era, the constitutions of Theodore of Studion, the separatism of Mt. Athos and legislation outlawing double monasteries, some ascetics continued to associate female communities with their foundations. Although Stephen the Younger's association with the patrician Anna and her community led (if we can believe the story) to outrage which might have been suspected by orthodox as well as iconoclasts in some circles of mid-Byzantine ascetic thought,¹⁶ some post-iconoclastic holy men continued to feel the need to provide for their female relatives. Peter of Atroa had already established a convent under his direction when his sister and her daughters were tonsured there, but Euthymios the Younger returned home after years of ascetic travel to bring his relatives to his foundation at Peristerai, where he established a monastery of women under the direction of his sister

¹⁵ Convents known in Thessalonica and environs include, in addition to Theodoros's convent and Euthymios the Younger's foundation (see below, note 17), a monastery dedicated to St. Luke near the agora: *V. Theodora Thessalonicensis* [ed. Kurtz, *Mémoires de l'Acad. imp. de St. Petersburg*, 8th series, Vol. 1 (1902), 1-16] p. 5 and a convent mentioned by Kameniates in his account of the sack of the city [*De Excidio Thessalonicensis* (ed. Gertrude Bohlig, Berlin, 1973), p. 51, to be taken with caution if Kazhdan's criticisms of this source are justified. See Alexander Kazhdan, "Some Questions Addressed to the Scholars who Believe in the Authenticity of Kameniates' 'Capture of Thessalonica', BZ 71 (1978), 301-314]. Descriptions and bibliography in Janin (1974), 349-350, 395, 411.

¹⁶ *V. Stephani junioris* (PG 100, 1069-1186) 1105-8; 1126-7; The biography presents accusations against Stephen and the patrician Anna, a member of the women's monastery on Mt. Auxentios and his 'spiritual daughter', in a 'falsely written letter' by a treacherous servant of the nun and a disciple of the saint. Whatever the real issues may have been, the saint's close relations with the women's monastery may have been a point of vulnerability in an age which would shortly produce iconophile regulations against double monasteries.

("blood-relative") Euphemia.¹⁷ Parallel, in both cases, was the passing on of their own authority to a masculine relative brought into the foundation for dynastic continuity.¹⁸ The eleventh century stylite Lazarus the Galesiot, despite rumors that had earlier forced him to leave one site for his column, set up a convent where mothers of disciples, converted sinners and female followers of the saint lived under the direction of his mother, the "blessed Eupraxia".¹⁹ These were not double monasteries, and their contact with the holy man and his masculine disciples was undoubtedly very limited. Furthermore, the association with these particular saints is significant, for Peter, Euthymios and Lazarus were all ascetics of a more than ordinarily spectacular cast, who had gained disciples and developed new communities through their reputations rather than entering an existing monastery. Whether their foundations reflected a sympathy with the desire of women to be associated with the charisma of a stylite (as the life of Lazarus suggests) the need to establish a family patrimony (Euthymios and Peter of Atroa came from modest backgrounds), or to provide for the relatives of disciples, the extension of their ascetic models to women is unique. We cannot identify other founders or patrons of provincial women's monasteries, lay or ecclesiastical, and, like the imperial foundations of the capital, these extraordinary convents tell us little about the communities in which most nuns lived. An Italo-Greek text describes a community which may have been much more the norm in provincial centers in the east (as well as Italy) in an episode where the tenth century saint Nilus the Younger was called in to reform a

¹⁷ Peter of Atroa: *Vita* by Sabas [ed. Vitalien Laurent, *La Vie merveilleuse de St. Pierre d'Atroa* (*Subsidia Hagiographica*, 29) Brussels, 1956] 44; Euthymios: *Vita* by Basil [ed. L. Petit, *Révue de l'orient chrétien* 8 (1903) 168-205] 37.

¹⁸ *V. Pet. Atroa*, 44; *Vita Retracta* [ed. V. Laurent, (*Subsidia Hagiographica* 31) Brussels, 1958] 1, 114. *V. Euthym. Jun.* 37.

¹⁹ Lazarus the Galesiot: *Vita* by Gregory the monk, [AASS Nov. III (1910) 508-588] 59, 164, 199, 201.

convent in a nearby village which had been founded by an imperial official and put under the charge of a monastic overseer. When its spiritual director died, the saint intervened to protect the convent from the local landowners who had seized its endowment; he reorganized the community, arguing with the town's citizens that such a center was necessary to protect their widows from the necessity of remarriage, and appointing an abbess to direct it.²⁰ Dependent on local support, serving the needs of a town to provide for its widows, lacking strong ascetic leadership, and always prey to outside attacks on its financial resources, Nilus's convent probably reflected a familiar provincial situation.

The theoretical concerns of the middle Byzantine world for the female ascetic derived largely from the principle of absolute separation of the sexes in monastic life. Laws regulating cloistered communities for men and women ascetics, enunciated in Justinianic and early conciliar legislation, were reiterated in this period and extended to cover new possibilities of communication. Avoidance of sexual temptation underlay a ban on the foundation of new double monasteries by the Seventh Ecumenical Council in 787 and their suppression altogether by the Patriarch Nicephorus. The prohibition was extended in the eleventh century by the Patriarch Alexios Studios to donors of monasteries, who were to provide for communities only of their own sex.²¹ In the late twelfth century the canonist Balsamon, reiterating traditional claims that the sexes should be mixed no more in death than in life, argued that the practices of burial and funerary remembrance offered further possibilities of abuse, and advised that no burials of members of the opposite sex be allowed in monasteries.²² The same prohibitions were included by Irene Dukaina in the *typikon* for her monastery of

²⁰ Nilus the Younger: *Vita* (PG 120, 15-165) 45-46.

²¹ Early cloister legislation: Justinian, *Novellae* 133, Ch. 1-3; *Conc. Nic. II*, Canon 20. *Vita Nicephori* [ed. de Boor, *Nicephori Archiepiscopi CP opuscula historica* (Leipzig, 1880), 139-217] 28; Alexios Studios, *Hypomnema*, PG 119, 837-844.

²² Balsamon, *Comm. in Can.* 47, *Conc. in Trullo*, PG 137, 680-684.

the Theotokos τῆς Κεχαριτωμένης in the early twelfth century, as they were in those for some contemporary male communities.²³ In theory remarkably few distinctions were drawn between men's and women's communities; the governing principle was that of "quae pro regimine monachorum sanctitae sunt, etiam pro monastriis... omnino vigere normas, ni aliter provideatur," and the repetition of provisions in identical language for male and female ascetics suggests that few exceptions were considered necessary.²⁴ Monks were to be as guarded from the sight of women as nuns from men. In contrast to the thorny problems of marriage regulation so often referred to the patriarchal synod in this period, no cases involving nuns or cloister needed patriarchal judgment. These new extensions of the separation of the sexes among ascetics could be read, in one sense, as a reflection of the constant Byzantine concern for completeness in the preservation of law and tradition.

Careful reading and commentary make it clear, however, that Byzantine theorists assumed that special conditions did affect nuns as a consequence of their female weakness. Justinian had required that nuns, unlike monks, be accompanied when they left their convents, and this law stood for a widespread recognition that female religious must be much more strictly enclosed than men, not only because of their physical vulnerability, but because their nature made them prey to inevitable sexual temptation at the sight of a man.²⁵ Theodore of Studion advised the nuns and recluses among his correspondents to "flee the sight of males as much as possible,

²³ *Typikon Kecharitomenes* 379, 14, 15, 17, 58, 74, 75, 76. Parallel provisions and exceptions in *typika* for masculine houses are summarized by Raymond Janin in "Monachisme byzantin au moyen âge: commende et typica (xi^e-xiv^e siècle)" [*Révue des études byzantines* 22 (1964) 5-44] 33-34.

²⁴ Placido de Meester, *De monachico statu juxta disciplinam byzantinam* (Vatican City, 1942) Tit. I Art. 26; Appendix, "De monialibus".

²⁵ *Ibid.*, "De monialibus" Art. 9, 10.

for in seeing them a fire is lit and sin blazes up,” and a penitential for nuns, ascribed to the seventh century Patriarch John the Faster, but generally considered a ninth or tenth century product, advised nuns that “where a woman has an unending desire for her husband, so you, as nuns, a holy temple in the spirit, have your desire in Christ your beloved.”²⁶ The inevitability of desire was reiterated by Alexios Studios in his legislation against donors of the opposite sex: temptation followed the sight of members of the opposite sex like “a fire in the grass.” It remained for Balsamon, in the twelfth century, to make the distinction explicit in a comment on the canonic requirement that nuns be accompanied when they left their convents; he explained the regulation as necessary because of the “liability to slip” of the feminine will.²⁷

For Balsamon, writing as a reformer of abuses in the late twelfth century, no invasion was too small to require comment. If monks could be conceived of as establishing a community guarded from women or even female animals, women’s communities were of necessity dependent on men for some services. Balsamon warns of the precautions to be followed in convent burials: only the doorkeepers and the abbess were to be present while the tomb was erected and the body covered. The grave-diggers were to perform their task as quickly as possible, leaving without seeing or being seen by any of

²⁶ Theodore of Studion, *Epistolae* [ed. J. Cozza-Luzzi, *Nova patrum bibliotheca* VIII, 1 (Rome, 1871), 1-244] 285, pp. 236-7. *Didascalia monazouson*, J.B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense* (Paris, 1858) IV, 416-428, p. 418: ...ὥθεν ὅσπερ ἐκείνη ἀδιάσπαστον ἔχει τὸν πόθον ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνδρα, οὕτω καὶ σύ, ὡς μοναζουσῶν ἱερὸν τέμενος ἔμψυχον καὶ θεότευκτον, ἐπὶ χριστὸν τὸν σὸν ἐραστήν, καὶ ὃν τρόπον ἐκείνη ἀεὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς πρὸς τὸν σύζυγον φέρει. The passage is a commentary on I Cor. VII, 33: Καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἀγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἢ ἁγία καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ἡ δὲ γαμήσασα μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῷ ἀνδρί. On the dating of this work to the middle Byzantine period see E. Hermann, “Il piu antico penitenziale greco” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 19 (1953) 70-127.

²⁷ Alexios Studios, *Hypomnema*, 840-41. Balsamon, *Comm. in Can. 46, Conc. in Trull.*: ...πάντως διὰ τὸ ὀλισθηρὸν τοῦ γυναικείου φρονήματος.

the nuns. A related abuse indicated another intrinsic feminine weakness: in a comment on the canons of Dionysios of Alexandria, Balsamon complained of the practice among nuns, required to remain outside the church when in a state of uncleanness due to their menstrual period, of withdrawing only to the vestibule of the church and thereby remaining on consecrated ground.²⁸ An even greater sense of detailed concern for the regulation of all possible invasions of cloister pervades the *typikon* of Irene Dukaina for the convent of the Theotokos τῆς Κεχαριτωμένης. Its well-known regulations provided that all priests and officials be eunuchs, that doctors be eunuchs or old men, that sick nuns see their fathers only if taken to the gate on a stretcher, and that masculine relatives might not even enter the church for a memorial service.²⁹ Balsamon and Irene Dukaina clearly sought to provide a schema, in as perfect and complete a form as possible, where nuns might live in total isolation from the outside world and the weaknesses of the flesh.

Clearly, this was an ideal unattainable in reality for most nuns. We know from Theodore of Studion's correspondence and from the writings of a tenth century bishop of Monembasia of the existence of recluses during this age, and some stories suggest strict seclusion of conventttttss.he *vita* of Theophanes describes the cure by proxy of an abbess suffering from a worm in the head, and the ninth century life of Peter of Atroa portrays a convent as needing special permission to come out of their community to meet the saint.³⁰ But in other sources nuns are to be met travelling to the shrines of masculine saints for cures, sitting in village churches, visiting

²⁸ Balsamon, *Comm. in Can. 47 Conc. in Trullo; In Epistola S. Dionysii Alexandriae, Canon II* (PG 138, 455-474) 465-468.

²⁹ *Typikon Kecharitomenes* 14, 15, 17, 58.

³⁰ *V. Theophanis a. Methodio* 62; *V. Petri Atroae* 31. In another episode, the abbess of the same convent came to meet the saint as he passed nearby (Ch. 24). Theodore of Studion, *Epistolae* (PG 99, 903-1679) II, 43, 69. The *narrationes* of Paul of Monembasia concerning the three recluses, (ed. M. Gedeon, *Ekklesiastiké Alethéia* 4, 1883/4) were not available to me.

famous ascetics in search of advice, and among the crowds at the deathbeds of two saints.³¹ They also left their convents to perform acts of service for relatives, as did Luke the Younger's sister Kale, who brought food regularly to the saint in his eremitic retreat and gave information about her brother to the biographer, or to serve imprisoned iconophiler or other ascetics.³² Holy men, it would seem, could provide permissible exceptions to cloister rules. Nevertheless, the overall impression gained by reading the biographies of the two abbesses at have come down to us from this age is of considerable seclusion.

Theodora of Thessalonica's life as a nun was spent entirely within her convent (with the exception of bringing a load of sticks from the market on her back), and the major theme of the life of St. Irene of Chrysobalantos was the saint's protection of the inviolability of her monastery against the invasions of magic, mice, men or the emperor. Her miracles were performed through prayer and visions, affecting the recipients at long distance without the saint's leaving her convent.³³ Frustration with such limitations is met only in a surprisingly sympathetic treatment in the eleventh century life of St. Lazarus the Galesiote; when a nun disguised herself as a man in order to join a pilgrimage and passed into his monastery with a crowd, the saint discovered her, asked why she attempted things impossible for a woman, and advised her to return lest she receive physical or bodily harm. The *vita* also describes the case of a nun who wished to build a hut near the base of the saint's column; although the woman was sent back to her cell, her piety was portrayed with sympathy by the biographer.³⁴

³¹ Travel to shrines: *Vita Eustratii Augari* [ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Análēkta hierosolymitikēs stachyologias* (St. Petersburg, 1891-1898), IV, 367-400; V 408-410] 53, 59; *V. Lazari* 28; Advice: *V. Petr. Atroa* 24.

³² Service: *V. Luca junioris* [PG 111, 441-480; suppl. E. Martini, *Analecta Bollandiana* 13 (1894), 81-121] 444-445 (PG). *Vita Michaelis Syncelli* [ed. Th. Schmit, *Kahrie-dzami* (*Isvestiia Russkii archeologicheskii institut v Konstantinople* 11 (1906) 227-239] p. 238.

³³ *Vita Theodoraе Thessalonicensis a. Gregorio clerico* [ed. Arsenij, *Žitie i podvigi sv. Theodorij Solunskoj* (Jurjev, 1899) 1-36]; *Vita retractata* [ed. Kurtz, *Mémoires de l'Académie imp. de Saint-Petersburg*, 8th series, VI. (1902) 1-36] 23; *Vita Irenes Chrysobalanti* (AASS Jul.. VI, 602-634) 41-50, 53-59; 66; 71-79.

³⁴ *V. Lazari* 56-58, 95.

It was not travel for cures or conversations with ascetic stars that must have provided the greatest disruption of the ideals of the canonists, but the roles expected by their patrons. Here it can be argued that the canonical regulations of the eleventh and twelfth centuries were not mere scholastic commentary, but reflections of real abuses, and that the issues raised by Balsamon and Studios are readily apparent in the literature of the middle Byzantine period. Thus, at least one powerful masculine patron — the emperor Basil I — was a crucial time visiting his daughters in the monastery in which he had enclosed them, and Anna Dalassena's munificent benefactions to her foundation of Christ Pantepoptos (apparently masculine) were accompanied by her decision to build an apartment within the monastery to which she later retired.³⁵ The presence of tombs and relics in conventual churches must have caused constant intrusions into the life of cloistered communities. Synaxarial lists of this period refer to convents as sites for the annual commemoration of some saints and martyrs, suggesting their occasional involvement in public ceremonial.³⁶ The imperial and aristocratic tombs in nun-

³⁵ Theoph. Cont. 275: ἐτύγχανε δὲ τηλικαῦτα διάγων κατὰ τὸ Πετρίον λεγόμενον, ἔνθα τὸ σεμνεῖον τῆς τῶν οἰκείων θυγατέρων διατριβῆς ἐχρημάτιζεν. Anna Dalassena's benefactions to her foundation of Christ Pantepoptos are recorded in two later acts acknowledging the transfer of the islands of Leros, Leipso and Pharmakon from this monastery to Myrelaion (Miklosich-Müller VI, 26-27, 32-33.) The foundation was certainly masculine by the end of the 12th century when a patriarch and an admiral were imprisoned there. Anna's retirement is attested by Zonaras, *Epit.* XVIII, 24, 8-18 (Bonn, III, p. 746); she had been tonsured for some time before her retirement, and most authors have assumed that she had apartments built in a masculine monastery. See the comment of Vitalian Laurent *Le Corpus des Sceaux de l'empire Byzantine*, Pt. 5, 2: *L'Eglise* (Paris, 1965) 1461.

³⁶ See note 2.

neries certainly were not devoid of family visitors, worshippers and tourists, as the deimpl tombs included in Constantine VII's *De Ceremoniis* demonstrates.³⁷ Above all, the development of cult centers in conventual churches would have provided a constant and demanding stream of visitors to convent churches possessing a miracle-working tomb. The *vitae* of the female saints of the period describe a sanctity based on the miraculous reputation of their relics; the biographies graphically portray the laymen, women and children who came to their tombs, often sleeping overnight, anointing themselves with the flowing oil from the lamps over the relics and touching the bodies of the saints. If the adjoining convents were cloistered, the nuns still served the churches and used them for liturgical purposes; their regimes could not have been undisturbed.³⁸ It is not surprising that Balsamon and Irene Dukaina prohibited the burial of men in convents or their presence at memor dead.

For the modern reader, surely the greatest conflict with the ideals lies in the sources of recruitment for nuns. In theory, nuns were virgins — ἀειπαρθένοι — dedicated to ascetic life before marriage. Such women are certainly to be found among the female ascetics of the period. The life of Theodora of Thessalonica describes several such figures: the saint's sister was a member of a convent on the island of Aegina, she had her daughter tonsured, and the posthumous miracles record the dedication of a girl born and cured after invocations to the saint.³⁹ A few other descriptions of family composition indicate the dedication of younger daughters to a con-

³⁷ *De Ceremoniis* (Bonn), II, 42.

³⁸ Public demands at shrines attached to convents are best seen in the posthumous miracles of Theodora of Thessalonica, *Vita*, 37-61, and *Translatio*, 37-40, and in the life of Athanasia of Aegina (AASS Aug. III, 170-175). Both texts describe the nuns' care of the shrine and the presence of worshippers, often sleeping near the shrine for several days. (*V. Theodoraë* 47, 51; *V. Athanasiae* 14-17).

³⁹ *V. Theodoraë* 6, 9; *Translatio* 13, 14.

vent. If the *vita* of Theodora of Thessalonica is to be believed, they may have been sent as very small children, despite the canonic regulations for minimum age of entry. Theodora's daughter was tonsured, according to her biographer, at six, and the child in a posthumous miracle at one.⁴⁰ A letter of Theodore of Studion to a father who wished to exchange a daughter in the convent for one at home suggests that parents may have attempted to modify their vows on occasion.⁴¹ Hagiographical texts also mention the dedication of older girls or young women to nunneries as a result of changes in family circumstances — generally when their fathers or fiancés entered ascetic life themselves.⁴²

But most of the nuns encountered in mid-Byzantine texts are not dedicated virgins, but widows, young or old, or women sent to convents for punishment or penance. Nilus the Younger's biographer's characterization of the Italian village convent as a retreat for widows had parallels at many levels of mid-Byzantine society, from the imperial widows who retired to their foundations to the widowed mothers of saints, whose entry into nunneries is a standard feature of the biographies of the age.⁴³ Hagiographical rhetoric notwithstanding, they were probably not performing acts of unusual piety, but entering an accepted stage of life desired by those women who could afford it. Thus, Irene Dukaina made provision

⁴⁰ Younger daughters vowed to convents: *V. Lucae junioris* 444-445; young ages: *V. Theodora* 9; *Translatio* 14.

⁴¹ Theodore of Studion, *Epistolae* (PG) II, 172.

⁴² Girls vowed to monastery at family breakup: *V. Joannis Psychaita* 2; *V. Petri Argi* 4; *V. Michaelis Syncelli* p. 229.

⁴³ Mothers of saints: *V. Michaelis Maleini* [ed. L. Petit, "Vie et office de S. Michael Maleinos." *Bibliothèque hagiographique orientale* IV (Paris, 1903), 7-26] 5; *V. Michaelis Syncelli* p. 229. *Vita Nicephori Miletii* [ed. H. Delehaye, *Analecta Bollandiana* 14 (1895) 133-161] 21; *V. Nicephori Medicii* [ed. F. Halkin, *Analecta Bollandiana* 78 (1960), 401-425] 5; *V. Petri Argi* 4.

for relatives who might wish to retire to her community or be tonsured before death, and one saint's life refers to his mother's convent as the "old women" (ταῖς γράϊσι).⁴⁴ Some widows were able to enter ascetic life on their own, rather than through their family's decisions: those described in saint's lives as undergoing a "conversion" to the monastic ideal already enjoyed the comparative independence of a widowed status. The *vita* of Lazarus the Galesiote, for example, mentions the entry of several such women, of varying economic status, into the women's convent near his column.⁴⁵ For some, ascetic life promised an opportunity for penance or protection. Eustratios of Augaros converted a mother and son guilty of incest to monastic life, the *vita* specifying that they were sent to communities far distant from each other. Lazarus's convent also included repentent sinners — one a notoriously stingy woman sought out by his disciples. In an especially striking story, the saint extended his prestige to offer shelter to the abused wife of a priest after she had attempted unsuccessfully to poison her husband through the eucharistic wine; Lazarus received her and commanded the abusive husband to allow his wife to remain in the night.⁴⁶

But if for these women monastic life could be a choice, a refuge or a standard stage of life, for others it was a forced retreat. Chroniclers condemn the cruelty of emperors who placed their mothers, sisters and wives in convents: the sisters of Romanos II wept at their tonsure and, according to one story, defiantly continued to eat meat. Nicephorus Botaneiates was considered heartless for enclosing his mother in a convent.⁴⁷ Canonically, the ascetic vocation was

⁴⁴ *Typikon Kecharitomenes* 4, 66.

⁴⁵ *V. Lazari* 62, 64, 74, 117.

⁴⁶ *V. Eustratii* 17, *V. Lazari* 125, 199.

⁴⁷ Theoph. Cont. (Bonn) 473; Cedrenus (Bonn) II, 344; Attaleiates (Bonn) 304.

held to be a matter of free decision, not unwilling enclosure. It was on these grounds that the Patriarch Ignatios refused to tonsure the Empress Theodora when Michael III forced her retirement to her foundation in 856, but there is no evidence that the principle was invoked when there were no comparable political considerations.⁴⁸ The church itself used assignment to a nunnery as punishment, as shown by the eleventh century cases of an adulterous woman and a wife whose second marriage had been nullified on grounds of consanguinity.⁴⁹ The 48th canon of the Council in Trullo, (providing that the wife of a priest promoted to the episcopate should enter a convent distant from his see), raised the issue of unwilling enclosure for Balsamon, who justified the provision by arguing that in freely choosing to marry a priest, for whom the possibility of promotion was already present, a woman signified her acceptance of a future commitment to monastic life — an argument that bore little relation to actual marriage practices.⁵⁰ In a society where women's choices in life were severely restricted, it cannot have been surprising to have dedication to a convent determined by others. But the presence of unprepared prisoners and penitents must, at the least, have posed a burden on the quality of the life of the community. At the imperial level, the dilution of the ascetic regime for willing, but untrained aristocratic women can be seen in the special privileges accorded them by Irene Dukaina in her *typikon*, and the disruption of unwilling women can be imagined in reading Anna Comnena's description of the imprisonment of the Comnena women in the convent of Petrion during the revolt of Alexios: special arrange-

⁴⁸ *Vita Ignatii* (PG 105, 488-574) 505.

⁴⁹ V. Grumel, *Les registres des actes du patriarchat de Constantinople* I, 3 (Paris, 1947) nos. 883, 933.

⁵⁰ Balsamon, *Comm. in Can. 48 Conc. in Trullo*, PG 137, 684-689.

ments were made with the guards to allow them access to daily news of their relatives, and to import whatever food-supplies they wished.⁵¹

Stronger evidence for the lack of “fit” between ascetic ideals and membership is provided by the descriptions of laywomen who were unable to enter ascetic life. Renunciation and chastity were certainly widely presented as the ideal life for both boys and girls. But where the masculine saints’ lives of the period popularized the theme of flight to avoid marriage and a secular career, the female biographies and other sources of the age did not raise any such possibility for women.⁵² These texts counseled only humility and obedience as cardinal virtues, and hagiographers developed the theme of secret asceticism among noble laywomen, who wore hair shirts under their clothing, kept monastic hours in their own apartments, and secretly fasted and avoided eating meat.⁵³ While the biographers of Athanasia of Aegina and Theodora of Thessalonica characterized their heroines as waiting for deliverance in widowhood, the lives of Maria of Bizye and Thomais of Lesbos exalted a much grimmer scenario: both heroines were presented as martyrs,

⁵¹ *Typikon Kecharitomenes* 4: Relaxation of the rule allowed Irene’s relatives, if unable to adapt to monastic life, to have private lodgings, two servants, and longer visits to sick relatives outside the monastery; noble women might have private apartments and one servant. Comnena women: Anna Comnena, *Alexiad* II, 5.

⁵² Flight to monastic life was a common *topos* of the mid-Byzantine period, occasionally described with dramatic disappearances on the marriage day. Some examples: *V. Antonii junioris* [ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Sylloge palestines kai syriakes hagiologias*, *Pravoslavnij palestinskij sbornik* 57 (XIX, 3, St. Petersburg, 1907) 186-216] 22-23; *V. Pauli jun.* 2; *V. Euthymii jun.* 6; *V. Eustratii* 5; *V. Michaelis Malein.* 56; *V. Macarii Pelecetes* [ed. I. Van den Gheyn, *Analecta Bollandiana* 16 (1897) 142-163] 3-4;.

⁵³ Secret asceticism: Theodore of Studion, *Oratio funebris in matrem suam* (PG 99 884-902) 3-4; *V. Mariae junioris* [ed. E. Kourilas, *Thrakika* 26 (1957) 111-147] 4-10; *V. Thomais Lesbiae* [AASS Nov. IV (1925), 234-242] 6; *V. Athanasiae Aeginae* 2; Empress Theophano: *Vita* [ed. E. Kurtz, *Mémoires de l’Acad. imp. de St. Petersburg*, 8th ser., III, 2 (1898), 1-24] 21-23.

resented, suspected and eventually beaten to death by their unsympathetic husbands.⁵⁴ We might suspect hagiographic exaggeration in these stories, but the impact of the ideal is dramatically evident in the career of another such closet ascetic — the empress Theophano, first wife of Leo VI. The only empress to be considered a saint for her private life, Theophano practiced, according to her biographer, a similar life of fasting, keeping liturgical hours in her own apartments, and wearing rough clothes.⁵⁵ The regime eventually brought Theophano a miracle-working tomb and a church and a convent dedicated to her memory, but while the hagiographer diplomatically portrayed her sympathetic support for the emperor and said nothing about her eventual repudiation by Leo, the incompatibility between her ascetic desires and the role of an empress are expressed openly in other sources.⁵⁶ Certainly she was a misfit, far more valuable to the emperor in death, as a saint whose tomb brought miraculous associations to the imperial house, than in life. Her example was not unparalleled; these *vitae* function as dramatic examples of the consequences of a religious world that preached a single ascetic ideal, yet offered little opportunity for its fulfillment by women who might wish to pursue it.

⁵⁴ *V. Mariae jun.* 12-23; *V. Thomais* 8, 15-16.

⁵⁵ *V. Theoph.* 21-23.

⁵⁶ The hagiographer describes the growth of the cult of Theophano (including his own family's devotion) in ch. 24-32 of the *Vita*. The Synaxarial accounts identify her as θαυματουργός (*Syn. Ecc. Cp.* 314). For the location and date of the convent's existence (by 1190) see G. Majeska, "The Body of St. Theophano the Empress and the convent of St. Constantine," *Byzantinoslavica* 37 (1976) 14-21. Neither her own biography nor that of the patriarch Euthymius mention Leo's repudiation of Theophano, but Symeon the Logothete does (PG 108, 1103). See also the scholia on Arethas quoted by P. Karlin-Hayter in her commentary on the life of the Patriarch Euthymius: Τοῦτο καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῶν γέγονε καὶ τὴν βασιλέως Θεοφάνω ἐξεμάνη πᾶς γυναικεῖα μανία ἁγιοποιῶν... *Vita Euthymii*, ed. P. Karlin-Hayter (*Bibliothèque de Byzantion*, 3), Brussels, 1970, 4, 7.

These conditions were obviously neither new nor unique to Byzantium; in a general way, much of what has been described above was the common experience of women ascetics throughout the medieval world.⁵⁷ It is also important to remember that, in many ways, convent life may not have been very distinctive from that of the upper-class laywoman in the middle Byzantine period. The ideal, at least, for feminine society in this age was one of a secluded existence, often lived out in separate quarters. Women's domain was to be the household, where she was praised for good management and training of slaves and small children.⁵⁸ Aside

⁵⁷ A parallel development in Frankish hagiography, where obedience to parental wishes becomes a model for women is described by Suzanne Wemple in *Women in Frankish Society* (Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 153-154, 164-174. Basic works on women's monasticism, seriously outdated, are still Lina Eckenstein, *Women Under Monasticism* (Cambridge, 1896) and Dom Philibert Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de St. Benoît, Vol. 7 (nuns)* (Maredsous, 1956). More specific treatments of individual figures and foundations are available in several recent collections of works on medieval women: *Medieval Women*, ed. Derek Baker (*Ecclesiastical History Society, Subsidia I*, Oxford, 1978); *Women in Medieval Society*, ed. Susan Mosher Stuard (Philadelphia, 1976) and *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 20 (1977) - a special issue on women in medieval society.

⁵⁸ For general commentary on the position of women in Byzantium, see Judith Herrin, "Der Veranderingen in de positie van vrouwen in her Byzantijnse Rijk," *Jaarboek voor vrouwengeschiedenis* (1980), 141-160; Joelle Beaucamp, "La situation juridique de la femme à Byzance," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 20 (1977) 146-176; J. Grossdidier de Matons, "La femme dans l'empire byzantin" in P. Grimal, ed., *Histoire mondiale de la femme*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1974) III, 11-43. I am grateful to Judith Herrin for describing some of her findings in the article above, which was not available to me. The ideal of restricted life for women is picturesquely described in the life of Philaretos the Almsgiver. When imperial officials seek his daughters' candidacy for an imperial bride-show, the saint replies that, despite his poverty, his daughters (and grand-daughters) remain in their own apartments: «ἡμεῖς εἰ καὶ πτωχοὶ ὑπάρχομεν, ἀλλ' οὖν αἱ θυγατέρες ἡμῶν οὐδέποτε ἐξήλθοσαν ἐκ τοῦ κουβούκλιον αὐτῶν...» The story should not be taken too strictly, but it reflects the ideals of women's saints lives of the period well.

from the liturgical hours, the activities of convents appear to have been the fairly standard household occupations associated with clothmaking, reading and education. It was evidently expected that women entering nunneries would bring servants with them.⁵⁹ Too little is known about the structure of the Byzantine household in this period for any more detailed comparisons, but it is certainly likely that women's household life was reproduced in convents in other ways. Other questions about internal life cannot yet be answered. The life of Theodora of Thessalonica, in particular, may offer glimpses of ascetic friendships, community life, and occasional meetings with nuns of other convents.⁶⁰ The evidence discussed so far is overwhelmingly upper-class or aristocratic in nature; was monastic life available for poor women? The abbesses whose antecedents are in any way known were certainly, like their late ancient counterparts, "blue-bloods", and family background probably counted for more than ascetic virtues or managerial ability in their elevation to leadership. The few incidental references to poor women as nuns cannot be generalized to give any idea whether a

⁵⁹ *Typikon Kecharitomenes* 6; the monastery was to be divided into two parts, one to be used for labor (handworks), with one nun to read from holy scriptures during the work. The life of Theodora describes the saint's work at a loom with her daughter (28). In addition to the provisions of Irene Dukaina for servants, reference to aristocratic women entering convents with some of their servants are common. Theodora's biographer, for example, describes her coming to the monastery with 3 serving girls and 100 gold pieces (20).

⁶⁰ *V. Theodora* 27-30, 43. Theodora's deathbed was attended by nuns from nearby monasteries.

wider presence of lower-class women may be inferred in middle Byzantine communities.⁶¹

In one area, however, mid-Byzantine nuns do seem to have made progress over their late ancient counterparts. Late antique images of nuns and abbesses generally portrayed them as dependent on masculine spiritual directors who dominated their lives as individuals or within their convents. Heroines like Paula, Melania the Younger and Olympias, known through their association with prominent ascetics, spring to mind immediately, but the tradition is also evident in later sources. The life of Matrona, for example (describing a fifth century saint, but probably written in the late sixth century) includes a dominant presbyter who makes all major decisions — concerning the founding, membership and architecture of the convent.⁶² By contrast, their mid-Byzantine role is clearly subordinate. Athanasia of Aegina's community had two presbyters much revered by the nuns for their miracles; we are not told their explicit authority, and the community had evidently functioned earlier without such leaders. In Theodora's convent in Thessalonica the city's archbishop (a relative) was consulted about her admission, but in this and subsequent issues her life was guided by the dominant figure of her abbess, the "great one";⁶³ Irene of Chryso-

⁶¹ Theodora's biography identifies her as a relative of the archbishop of the city, Antonios, and the abbess of her convent. Although the saint refused to become abbess of another monastery, her daughter succeeded to the direction of Theodora's foundation (9, 10, 36, 37). Irene of Chrysobalantos is identified in her *vita* as a member of the Gouberos family (*V. Irenes* 8). On the Gouberii, see R. Guiland, "Contribution à la prosopographie byzantine: les patrices." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 63 (1970) p. 309. Athanasia of Aegina is described in the more typical hagiographical rhetoric as the daughter of parents "genere praestantibus" (*V. Athanasiae*, 1). The life of Lazarus the Galesiot comments on the poverty of a priest whose mother followed him into the saint's discipleship, and implies that their situation was exceptional, but no further generalization seems possible (*V. Lazari*, 164).

⁶² *Vita Matronae* [AASS Nov. III (1919) 790-813] 36-42. On the dating of the *vita*, see Delehaye's preface to the edition, p. 790.

⁶³ *V. Theodora* 13-19; *V. Athanasiae* 7-8.

balantos had no known “spiritual father”; the only such guidance in the biography is a sermon put in the mouth of the Patriarch Methodios at the time of her election. Her own spiritual authority over her nuns is indicated by the gift of clairvoyance, accepted, according to the hagiographer, because the saint recognized its value in seeing into the souls of her charges.⁶⁴ The *typikon* of Irene Dukaina makes the role of masculine officials within her community clearly subordinate to the power of both abbess and patron (Irene herself and her successor — ἡ ἀντιλαβωμένη).⁶⁵ Within their own convents, thus, women were considered capable of directing their own spiritual and communal life and of following an ascetic canon that did not differ significantly from that of their masculine counterparts — whether by omission or because they could, in fact, carry out the same practices.

In the end, the largely incidental references to women in religious life on which this paper is based suggest a picture of mixed contradiction and success familiar in other medieval settings. Aiming at perpetual virginity, convents appear to have been filled with widows and, on occasion, women sent there for punishment or penance. Preached as the highest ideal for women, they were open by parental design rather than choice; vowed to separation from the world, convents performed functions for their patrons that brought the world to their churches. Yet there were some successes, and this paper should perhaps end on a positive note, with the consideration that within this severely restricted world, the middle Byzantine period produced a few works lauding nuns and abbesses as saints who were capable of practicing and directing, within their convents, a rigorous regime, and of receiving, through their relics, the same post-mortem power of miraculous healing their masculine contemporaries were expected to possess.

⁶⁴ *V. Irenes* 19-22, 30.

⁶⁵ *Typikon Kecharitomenes*, esp. 12-14 (on the election of an abbess), 15-61 (role of priests).

OBSERVATIONS ON THE LIFE AND IDEOLOGY OF BYZANTINE WOMEN

ANGELIKI E. LAIOU / CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The study of women, as a social group which lived and functioned under specific conditions and disabilities, is still in its infancy as far as Byzantine history is concerned. Almost every question which may be posed — whether relating to the legal status of women, or their economic activities, or their ideology — cannot yet be answered definitively. Even what might have been thought to be an obvious subject, that is, the representation of women in art, is largely untouched. The situation is more complex when it comes to the Byzantine society's perception of women. Here, modern scholars labor, for the most part, under misconceptions, the result of a selective reading of the sources.¹

The social historian who approaches the subject of women in Byzantium has a double task: for one thing, realities must be established: the role of women in politics, economics, religion must be

¹ Angeliki E. Laiou, "The Role of Women in Byzantine Society", *Jahrbuch der Oesterreichischen Byzantinistik*, 31/1 (1981), 233-250.

discovered, despite the fact that the sources are often recalcitrant. Secondly, the role of ideology must be clarified; in particular, it seems essential to study the perception women had of themselves as females, and the degree to which this perception may have diverged from male ideology on this issue.

The present study is an effort to approach both of these questions, in a rather limited way. It starts with the premise that texts written by women, or texts in the writing of which women participated in a major way, should be used in order to try to establish the parameters of the female mentality. A number of such texts, therefore, are analysed, with that purpose in mind. Secondly, the author considers that it is of some profit to study the life of women in institutions which they themselves organised and ran. The only such institutions were convents; for, although convents had to follow a certain ecclesiastical tradition, variation, not only from the practices of male monasteries, but also from convent to convent, was both possible and actual.² It seems clear, therefore, that the various convents which were established by women, and whose foundation charters were issued by women, did not simply follow a general norm established for both male and female foundations, but rather followed patterns suited specifically to the needs of the nuns, and, to some degree, to the idiosyncracies of the foundresses. The study of the *typika* of various convents will, I hope, reveal both some aspects of the reality of female existence in the Byzantine Empire, and a part of the ideological world of the women.

The use of sources for this study has been perforce selective. First of all, the study is limited chronologically to the period beginning with the eleventh century. Thus, it does not include the writings of hymnographers, such as Cassia. Secondly, the extant writings of women are surprisingly few in a society which, especially after the 11th century, could boast of a certain degree of female literacy and even, at times, of highly learned aristocratic women.³ Indeed, the

² R. Janin, "Le monachisme byzantin au moyen âge; commende et typica (Xe-XIVe siècle)", *Revue des études byzantines*, 22 (1964), 5, stresses the individuality of the various *typika*.

³ Laiou, *op.cit.*, 253-257. The official documents issued by Byzantine Empresses have been studied by F. Barišić, "Povelje Vizantijskih Tsaritsa," *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta*, 13 (1971), 143-202.

writings of Anna Komnene are the only substantial surviving work written by a woman, and these have already been analysed to some extent.⁴ It remains to be seen whether Anna Komnene was a woman representative of her time, or whether she was a very rare exception. I have not used her writings extensively, in part because they constitute trodden ground. The other texts written by women consist primarily of wills, acts of sale or donation, and *typika* of female monasteries⁵. There exist also other short texts, such as the embroidered texts of the despotissa Jelena-Jefimija, wife of the Despot John Uglješa.⁶ I have used a few of the acts of sale and donation, since the majority of them simply follow a formula, and give no glimpse into the character or thoughts of the donatrice.⁷ On

⁴ See, primarily, G. Buckler, *Anna Comnena* (Oxford, 1968).

⁵ The texts used (apart from the *typika*) consist of: a. a donation of the nun Glykeria to the *hegoumenos* of Lavra (1016): P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, N. Svoronos, D. Papachryssanthou, *Actes de Lavra*, I (Paris, 1970), no 20; b. The testament of Kale Pakouriane, in Ioakeim Iverites, «Βυζαντινὰ Διαθῆκαι», *Orthodoxia*, 6 (1931), 364-371 (late 11th century). On this, cf. K. Amantos, «Περὶ τῶν Βυζαντινῶν διαθηκῶν», *Proceedings of the 9th International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, II (Thessalonica, 1956), 283-284; F. Dölger, *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges* (Munich, 1943), no. 65; P. Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le onzième siècle* (Paris, 1977), p. 161, n. 102; c. Donation of the nun Ypomone to the monastery of Prodomos (1339): A. Guillou, *Les archives de St. - Jean-Prodrome sur le mont Ménécée* (Paris, 1955) no. 34; d. Act of donation, by Theodora Kantakouzene, to the monastery of Kutlumus (1338): P. Lemerle, *Actes de Kutlumus* (Paris, 1945), no 18; e. Act of sale, by Philippa Asanina, to the monastery of Xeropotamou (1349): J. Bompair, *Actes de Xéropotamou* (Paris, 1964), no. 26; f. Testament of the nun Nymphodora (1445), *ibid*, no. 30; g. The prologue to the testament of Anna Komnene (ca. 1122), in E. Kurtz, "Unedierte Texte aus der Zeit des Kaisers Johannes Komnenos," *BZ* 16 (1907), 93-101. The editor suggests that this text may have been written by someone else for Anna, but there is no reason to accept this hypothesis.

⁶ G. Ostrogorski, *Serska Oblast posle Dušanove smrti* (Belgrade, 1965), 141 n. 64. Dj. Radojičić, *Antologija stare srpske Književnosti* (Belgrade, 1960), 96-98.

⁷ For example, doc. no. XII in P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, N. Svoronos, D. Papachryssanthou, *Actes de Lavra*, III (Paris, 1979), although issued by Agape Sphrahtzaina Palaiologina, has no particular interest for our purposes. Another document, an act of sale by Eudokia Rasopolia to the monastery of Docheiariou (1112), which I owe to the kindness of N. Oikonomides, is important in terms of the legal history of the position of women, but not for the purposes of this study.

the other hand, wills almost always are documents in which the personality of the testator is evident; I have, therefore, used all the published wills attributed to women. Finally, I have used extensively the *typika* issued by women, and have made limited use of the *typika* issued by men for female foundations.

The private acts issued by women have certain characteristics in common. Perhaps the most obvious is an ostensible piety, which is probably to be expected both in wills and in acts of donation to monasteries. Within that general statement, however, there are particularities. Piety seems to range, from an almost incidental virtue in the case of the donation of lands by the nun Ypomone, and the testament of Anna Komnene, to the rather mystical faith of which the testament of the nun Nymphodora is redolent. The act of the nun Ypomone is an unremarkable document, by which she donates to the monastery of St. John Prodromos a small monastery founded by her husband, along with its lands, animals, sacred vessels and books. This did not constitute the sum total of her property; indeed the family property had been distributed to her children, and this last possession was given to St. John Prodromos in return for an annual donation of food to her, and after her death to her children. It is an arrangement which, although it incorporates a certain piety, neither dissolves the family (or the family property) in favor of the monastery, nor is inspired by spiritual motives alone, since she gets from the monastery enough for her sustenance.

The case of the nun Nymphodora is significantly different. Her testament, written in 1445, quotes a number of biblical texts and theological formulae; she commits her "tripartite soul" to the "thrishypostatic" Divinity; she invokes the wrath of God, Christ, the Virgin, the twelve apostles, the four evangelists, the 318 holy fathers who participated in the council of Nicaea and all the saints against those who might, in the future, break the provisions of her will. She was particularly concerned that prayers be offered in her name twice a week, and this is the provision she most wishes to safeguard. It is true that she also expects the monastery of Xeropotamou to give her food, until she dies, but no stress is placed on that statement, and no details are given. It would seem, indeed, that her primary concerns were spiritual; for what she gave to the monastery included, along with a church, a house, and other real estate and moveable goods, a one-fourth interest in one business connected with the mines of Siderokauseia, and a half-interest in another. These seem to have been going concerns, so that she probably did

not need the *adelfaton* which she expected to receive from the monastery.

If the testament of Nymphodora is the most vocally pious of the acts issued by females, there are others in which a true — as opposed to a conventional — piety is evident. Such is the act of donation of some lands by Theodora Kantakouzene to the monastery of Kutlumus. In it, she deplors her life-long concern with the things of this world; asserting the superiority of the soul over the body, she regrets the fact that, as she says, she has made the soul serve the body instead of the reverse. This almost formulaic statement simply means that, when she reached an advanced age (she was 58 or 63 years old when the act of donation was drawn up)⁸, she regretted her deep involvement in the economic affairs of her household and in the political affairs of the Empire, which is well attested⁹, and which, it should be stressed, continued until the end of her life. In any case, having reached an age in which death might be expected, she considered her sins, found them heavy, and made donations of land and movable goods to the monastery of Kutlumus — and to other monasteries — in return for masses to be sung for the remission of her sins and the salvation of her soul.

Kale Pakouriane, the widow of Symbatios Pakourianos, has left a very interesting testament, which, however, cannot be fully analysed until it has been re-edited. One striking clause discusses arrangements to be made for her funeral: she professes a true disdain for her “unclean body”, and expresses the contempt by specifying that her body should be buried wherever death might overtake her — whether in the city or outside it — thus proving her lack of interest in what happens to her mortal remains. But she did make generous provisions for her funeral and memorial services, allowing for that purpose 100 “litras tracheas.”¹⁰

By her testament, Kale Pakoriane disposed of considerable property. The meticulous provisions by which she willed her lands, her books, her clothing and jewels are to be contrasted to the much less

⁸ D.M. Nicol, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos (Cantacuzenus) ca. 1100-1460* (Washington, DC. 1968), no. 21.

⁹ For a sketch of her activities, see Nicol, *op.cit.*, and Lemerle, *Kutlumus*, 86-87.

¹⁰ Iverites, «Βυζαντινὰ Διαθήκαι», p. 369.

detailed, summary dispositions of the will of her husband, who had made her one of the executors of his own testament.¹¹ Kale also had a considerable number of retainers and slaves, whom she freed, and her *paroikoi* were to be relieved of their taxes after her death, so that they would pray for her soul. It is a document which combines piety and pragmatism, attitudes which seem to characterise a number of Byzantine women, throughout the Comnenian and Palaiologan periods. It is, for example, evident in two cases in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, where two women brought to court cases concerning the exploitation of two icons. In the first case, a nun called Euphrosyne, from the Peloponnessos, had inherited the right to 50% of the revenues which accrued to a — presumably miraculous — icon; she had built a church for it, but kept quarrelling with the ecclesiastical authorities which wanted to appropriate all the revenues, until the case was resolved in her favor by an ecclesiastical court.¹² In the second case, the right to exploit an icon seems to have been a preserve of the females of the family of Gavras; the revenues, from masses, oil, and candles offered to the icon by worshippers, had been taken over by a man, and the most recent female holder of the rights of exploitation, a certain Vatatzina Gavraina, brought the case to court.¹³ The participation of women in the lucrative business of owning and exploiting miraculous or famous icons is quite old, going back at least to the early eleventh century, when four of the 31 lay people involved in a confraternity which exploited an icon of the Virgin in Naupaktos were women.¹⁴ Similarly, women appear to have played a primary

¹¹ Ioakeim Iverites, «Βυζαντινὰ Διαθήκαι», *Orthodoxia*, 5 (1930), 614-618. It is to be dated to 1090: Lemerle, *Cinq études*, p. 161, n. 102.

¹² F. Miklosich, J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, I, (Vienna, 1860), 52-53 (1316); cf. J. Darrouzès, *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople, I: Les actes des patriarches*, (Paris, 1977), no. 2064.

¹³ Miklosich-Müller, *Acta*, II, 513-515 (1401).

¹⁴ J. Nesbitt, J. Wiita, "A Confraternity of the Comnenian era," *BZ* 68 (1975), 369 (Manacho is a woman, not a man).

role in the litany of the Odegetria, in Constantinople.¹⁵ Whereas men also were involved in such matters, the blend of pragmatism and piety is, I think, particularly striking in the case of women.

It has already been stressed elsewhere, that, for reasons which were grounded in the exigencies of existence, as well as in ideology, women were most protected, respected, and active in the family.¹⁶ The documents which we are examining make it clear that the women too saw themselves as functioning primarily in the family. Almost every one of the women who wrote these documents identified herself through her parents, her husband, or both. Theodora Kantakouzene spoke at some length of her parents, especially her mother (Theodote Glavaina Doukaina Tarchaneiotissa), whose piety she wished she had emulated, and whose intercession she sought.¹⁷ Her husband she did not mention at all.

Anna Komnene, whose pride in her aristocratic origins needs no elaboration, devoted almost the entirety of the prologue of her testament to a discussion of her parents, her husband and, much less extensively, her children. But the nun Glykeria, also, writing more than a century earlier from the island of Skyros, identified herself by her parentage and her marriage.¹⁸ Kale Pakouriane left most of her movable property to her close relatives and her freed slaves; three of the five executors of her will were relatives: her mother, her brother-in-law, and her cousin, and she trusted them to execute accurately her decisions because of the relationship to her and their love of her.

¹⁵ This can be seen in the fresco discovered in the church of the Vlacherniotissa in Arta, by Mrs. M. Acheimastou-Potamianou: "The Byzantine Wall Paintings of Vlacherna Monastery (Area of Arta)," *Actes du XVe Congrès international d'études byzantines*, II, *Art et archéologie, Communications* (Athens, 1981).

¹⁶ Laiou, "Role of Women", 233 ff.

¹⁷ Lemerle, *Kutlumas*, 85.

¹⁸ Philippa Asanina identified herself as the daughter of Demetrios Asanes and the wife of Michael Kontopetres; Kale Pakouriane mentioned first her parents and then the husband to whom they wed her; the nun Ypomone identified herself as the widow of the *sakellarios* Mourmouras, while Nymphodora identified herself simply as a *protosebaste*, with no other qualifiers: H. Hunger, "Zwei byzantinische Urkunden der späten Palaiologenzeit aus der Oesterreichischen Nationalbibliothek," in idem, *Byzantinische Grundlagsforschung* (London, Variorum Reprints, 1973), no. VI, p. 305.

More specifically, women placed on their role as mothers the same importance which society in general accorded to it. Theodora Kantakouzene, a remarkable woman by all accounts, claimed that, of all the great fortune she had been blessed with, she considered nothing greater than the fact that she was the mother of John Kantakouzenos. This is unlikely to have been a mere rhetorical flourish, for the entire passage devoted to her son is redolent of profound love and pride in him, and quite moving in its tenderness.¹⁹

The obverse side of these observations is the helplessness which women felt when their family was disrupted, dissolved, or incomplete. The famous lament of Anna Komnene at the end of the *Alexiad* describes her sense of loss, loneliness and suffering after the death of her parents and, later, of her husband.²⁰ If she overstated her calamities, and certainly exaggerated her helplessness, she was nevertheless expressing sentiments which her contemporaries would have recognised as being proper. In the other documents also, the authors express not only grief at the loss of a husband, but also a state of helplessness: if women came into their own in the family, widowhood was a complicated state. Some women then acquired the financial means and the freedom to lead an independent existence and to take economic initiatives. But for others, widowhood meant insecurity, or at least so they said with a regularity which may signal a commonplace. Thus, the nun Glykeria attributed the difficulties which beset her after her husband's death precisely to the fact that she was widowed and childless.²¹ Kale Pakouriane, despite her great wealth and large number of relatives,

¹⁹ Lemerle, *Kutlumas*, 87: «καὶ πρὸ πάντων σὲ τὸν ἐμοὶ φίλτατον πάντων καταλιπούση τὸν ἐμὸν Ἰωάννην, τοὺς ἐμοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, τὴν ἐμὴν καρδίαν, τὸ ἐμὸν ἐντρύφημα καὶ καλλώπισμα, ... ὃν καὶ πρὶν προσαγαγεῖν εἰς βίον κἂν τοῖς μεταυτὰ καὶ ὅλως ἐξαρχῆς ἐς δεῦρο πολλῶν πρὸς Θεοῦ καὶ μεγάλων ἀπολαύσασα τῶν ἐν βίῳ, οὐδενὶ τῶν πάντων εὐδαίμων οἶμαι τοσοῦτον φανῆναι ὅσον τῷ τούτου μήτηρ φανῆναι...»

²⁰ *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, ed. A. Reifferscheid, II (Leipzig, 1884), XV, 11 (316-317).

²¹ Lavra, I. p.20, ll. 35-36.

considered herself to “have been left unprotected, inconsolable and alone” after her husband’s death. Nymphodora was separated from her husband not through death, but rather through his decision to go to Mount Athos and leave her in Siderokauseia, for which action she blamed him²². Only Theodora Kantakouzene claimed no special disability or helplessness because of her widowhood.

Childlessness, too, was a state women found shaming and disabling. In the eleventh century, Glykeria repeated twice in her act of donation the fact that she and her husband were childless and without heirs. Later in the century, Kale Pakouriane, mentioning her and her husband’s childlessness, considered it “a shameful thing for everyone, and especially for women.”²³

Other sources of the later period confirm the particular female attachment to family, in a variety of ways. The fact that women, when alienating property, tended to sell it to members of their family²⁴ is an economic expression of the phenomenon. Its social dimension is given, among others, by the Cretan monk Nilos Damilas who, when drawing up a *typikon* for a convent, specified that women with young children could not take their final vows until their ability to endure the loss of their children had been tested for a year. Indeed, if a woman had female children under ten years of age, he would not admit her at all.²⁵ The bishop of Philadelphia Theoleptos, the spiritual father of the convent of Christos Philantropos and of its foundress, Irene Choumnaina Palaiologina, wrote a number of letters and orations, giving advice both to the nuns and to the monks of this double monastery. It is, I think, significant that in his letters to the nuns (but not in his admonitions to the monks) he stresses repeatedly the fact that the women have abandoned their parents, their brothers and sisters, and their other relatives in order to embrace the monastic life.²⁶ It is, precisely, the ties to her

²² Xéropotamou, 217. Philippa Asanina claims to need special protection because of being orphaned, while she was still under age: Xéropotamou, 195.

²³ Iverites, *op.cit.*, vol. 6, p. 364: «ἄμοιροι γὰρ παίδων διετερήθημεν, πράγματος ἐπονειδίστου τοῖς ἅπασιν, μᾶλλον δὲ γυναιξί...»

²⁴ Laiou, “Role of Women”, 241.

²⁵ S. Petridès, “Le typikon de Nil Damilas pour le monastère des femmes de Baeconia en Crète (1400),” *Izvestija Russk. Arch. Inst. v KP*, XV (1911), 100.

²⁶ Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, fo. 12ro, 138ro.

family that he feared might make Irene Choumnaina lead a less than perfect monastic life.²⁷ Thus, the attachment of women to family was both a factor of reality and, perhaps even more strongly and insistently so, an important element in perceived reality.

The *typika* which were issued by women in order to regulate life in convents which they had founded are the most important single group of sources written by women. The information they provide concerns not only the religious life of such foundations, but also the economic activities of women and the economic life of the foundations. The *typika* also reflect some of the social values held by the foundresses, and even to some extent their personalities. To what extent the values and regulations which appear in the *typika* were actually followed in practice is a different matter, which it is sometimes possible to explore. Information about women may be gleaned from the *typika* of male monasteries as well, but these are of only incidental concern for this study.

Not many of the *typika* of convents have survived. There is the *typikon* of Irene Doukaina for the convent of Kecharitomene in Constantinople, issued ca. 1118, which in many ways is the most developed of these documents, and perhaps the most interesting (I).²⁸ The convent was located in the vicinity of the Gate of Adria-

²⁷ *Ibid.*, fo. 58vo-59vo.

²⁸ *Irenes Augustae typicum sive regula*, in Migne *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 127 coll. 986-1127 (hereafter, Typ.I). Cf. Kurtz, *BZ*, XVI, p. 95. For commentaries on the *typikon* see L. Oeconomos, "La vie religieuse dans l'empire byzantin au temps des Comnènes et des Anges, (Paris, 1918), 169-92 (mostly a summary of its provisions); F. Chalandon, *Jean II Comnène (1118-1143) et Manuel I Comnène (1143-1180)* (Paris 1912), 23ff; Janin, "Monachisme", 36-38. Varying lists of *typika* are given in: Janin, "Monachisme", 18-21; H. Delehay, "Deux typica byzantins de l'époque des Paléologues," *Extrait des mémoires publiés par l'Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des lettres*, ser. II, vol. XIII, 4 (1921), 4-8; K.A. Manaphes, *Μοναστηριακά Τυπικά-Διαθήκαι* (Athens, 1970), 178-190. For studies of *typika*, cf. E. Herman, "Ricerche sulle istituzioni monastiche bizantine. Typika ktetorika, caristicari e monasteri "liberi," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, VI (1940), 293-375; P. de Meester, "Les typiques de fondation," *Atti del V Congresso Internazionale di Studi Bizantini*, II (Rome, 1940), 489-508.

people, near the convent of St. Nicholas, and there is some evidence that it still functioned in the early fourteenth century, although references to it are very scarce.²⁹ Several *typika* survive from the Palaiologan period. The Empress Theodora, wife of Michael VIII and mother of Andronikos II, restored the monastery of Lips after 1282, and gave it a *typikon*, which survives (II). The monastery was located in the Lycus valley, and survived until the end of the Empire, its church serving as the burial place for members of the imperial family.³⁰ The *typikon* of the small convent of Agioi Anargyroi (III), also restored by the Empress Theodora, is appended to that of the convent of Lips.³¹ In the early fourteenth century, after having become widowed, in 1307, Irene Choumnaina Palaiologina, who had married John Palaiologos, son of Andronikos II, restored a monastery. Her parents also contributed to the restoration. It became the double monastery of Christos Philanthropos, situated near the palace of the Mangana, and flourishing during the lifetime of its foundress, who died ca. 1360. The surviving *typikon*, issued by Irene-Eulogia, is only a fragment (IV). It contains a few provisions, the most important being that the convent should be a *koinobion*, and mentions the fact that the original contained many other clauses (one on poverty is specifically mentioned) which were then omitted for the sake of brevity.³² The convent of Christos Philanthropos and its foundress have been studied by a number of scholars, partly because the personality and life of Irene-Eulogia are intri-

²⁹ R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris 1953), 199, and idem, *Constantinople byzantine* (Paris 1964), map 1.

³⁰ Delehaye, "Deux typica", pp. 106-136, 172-185 (Typ. II); Janin, *Géographie*, 318-321.

³¹ Delehaye, "Deux typica", pp. 136-140, 186-187 (Typ. III); Janin *Géographie*, 296.

³² Ph. Meyer, "Bruchstücke zweier τυπικά κτητορικά", *BZ* 4, (1895), 48-49, 57-58 (Typ. IV); There is an excellent study by V. Laurent, "Une princesse byzantine au cloître," *Echos d'Orient*, 29 (1930), 29-60. See also Janin, *Géographie*, 541-544. For the date, see, in the last instance, A.M. M. Talbot, *The correspondence of Athanasius I, Patriarch of Constantinople* (Washington, D.C., 1975), 425-6.

guing, and partly because of the connection of the convent (and its foundress) with Theoleptos of Philadelphia, who has left a series of letters and homilies addressed to the nuns and monks of this double monastery.³³

The *typikon* for the convent of the Theotokos Vevaias Elpidos (of Good Hope) was issued after 1310 and before 1345 by Theodora, daughter of the *sebastokrator* Constantine, (who was the brother of Michael VIII), and wife of the *megas stratopedarches* John Komnenos Doukas Synadenos (V). The *typikon* has been of interest to scholars primarily because it incorporates a number of portraits of the foundress, her husband, and members of her immediate family, as well as a group portrait of the nuns.³⁴ The *typikon* is completed by a second and much shorter one, issued by Euphrosyne, the daughter of the foundress. The convent was later restored by Xene Philanthropene (in 1392), and her daughter Eugenia Kantakouzene (in 1398 and 1401).³⁵

Of a different type, since it was written by a man, Nilos Damilas, is the *typikon* for a nunnery called "of the Theotokos Pantanassa", and situated in Baeonia, in the diocese of Hierapetra, in Crete (VI). The *typikon*, issued in 1400, is different from the others not only because it did not originate with a woman, but also because it was written for a nunnery in an area which was under foreign (Venetian) domination; this may account for the brief and not particularly detailed form of the *typikon* which — and this is another peculiarity — was written by a notary, Georgios Delagranta.³⁶ The

³³ On double monasteries, see J. Pargoire, "Les monastères doubles chez les Byzantins," *Échos d'Orient*, IX (1906), 21-35. On life in this double monastery, cf. S. Salaville, "Une lettre et un discours inédits de Théolepte de Philadelphie", *Revue des études byzantines*, 5 (1947), 101-115; idem, "La vie monastique grecque au début du XIVe siècle," *Études byzantines*, II (1944), 119-125.

³⁴ Delehay, "Deux typica," 10-105, 141-172 (Typ. V); I. Spatharakis, *The Portrait in Byzantine Illuminated Manuscripts* (Leyden, 1976), 190ff.

³⁵ Delehay, "Deux typica," 96-105. On the location of the convent, cf. Janin, *Géographie*, 166-168.

³⁶ Petridès, "Typikon," 92-111 (hereafter, Typ. VI).

typikon of Damilas will, however, be considered along with the others, for purposes of comparison. It is particularly valuable for this purpose, since the convent whose life it regulates does not seem to have been designed for aristocratic ladies, unlike the convents described by the other surviving *typika*.

It is evident that the surviving *typika* are but a small portion of what must have existed, and a biased one. We know that there were other convents with their own *typika*. One example is the convent founded by the bishop of Argos and Nauplia before 1143. It had been situated in Areia, near the sea, where it was exposed to the incessant attacks of pirates. The bishop, after a time, moved the convent inland, and changed the original foundation into a male one. The convent had been given a *typikon*, but there is reference to only a few of its provisions in the introduction to the *typikon* of the monastery for men, issued by the same bishop.³⁷ We also know that many women were foundresses of nunneries or monasteries. Thus, for example, Martha Tachaneiotissa, sister of Michael VIII, founded the convent called "tes kyra Marthas", in Constantinople. She and her husband together had founded the monastery of the Pammakaristos.³⁸ Irene Doukaina was cofoundress, with her husband Alexios I, of the monastery of Philantropos Soter; Irene of Hungary was co-foundress of the monastery and hospital of Pantokrator, although she was dead by the time that her husband John Komnenos drew up the *typikon*, in 1136.³⁹ The women mentioned

³⁷ F. Miklosich, J. Müller, *Acta et Diplomata Graeca*, V, 178-183; cf. Janin, "Monachisme," 41.

³⁸ Delehaye, "Deux typica," 156ff.; V. Laurent, "Kyra Martha—Essai de topographie et de prosopographie byzantines," *Échos d'Orient*, 38 (1939) 320ff; Janin, *Géographie*, 336-337, 217-221. For different prosopographical information, cf. A.E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins: The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282-1328* Cambridge, Mass., 1972), p. 94, n.27.

³⁹ P. Gautier, "Le typikon du Christ Sauveur Pantocrator," *Revue des études byzantines*, 32 (1974), 1ff.

here were all aristocratic ladies, and undoubtedly drew up, or caused to be drawn up, foundation charters for their monasteries. But there were also other women, not of the aristocracy, who were responsible for small foundations, and who may have produced typika which have not survived.⁴⁰ The survival of most of the extant typika (with the exception of that issued by Damilas) is due to the fact that these concerned convents which were founded by imperial ladies, in Constantinople, and were fairly important and rich institutions. The heavy chronological concentration in the fourteenth century is to be ascribed to the usual pattern of source survival of Byzantine documentary sources.

The surviving typika were issued by two Empresses (Irene Doukaina and Theodora), an Empress in name only (Irene Choumnaina Palaiologina), a lady of the imperial family (Theodora Synadene, niece of the empress Theodora mentioned above), and a monk. The first observation concerning the foundresses is that all of them expressed in the typika a great pride for their family. Irene Doukaina signed herself as "Εἰρήνη ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ πιστὴ βασίλισσα Ῥωμαίων ἢ Δούκαινα." Irene Choumnaina gave herself the name and title of "εὐσεβοῦς βασιλίσσης Εἰρήνης Λασκαρίνης τῆς Παλαιολογίνης," which for so long misled scholars and sent them searching for a Lascarid Empress.⁴¹ Her case is particularly interesting; for it is well known that the Empress Yolanda-Irene of Montferrat had considered a mésalliance the marriage of her son John to the daughter of Nikephoros Choumnos, and had sought to prevent it.⁴² It is, therefore, all the more striking that Irene Choumnaina should avoid using her paternal name, and that her father habitually addressed her as "the Empress Irene Palaiologina".⁴³ Theo-

⁴⁰ Among the many such cases, I mention those of the nun Ypomone (Guillou, *St. Jean Prodrome*, no.34) and of Glykeria (*Lavra*, I, no.20).

⁴¹ Typ.I, 1108; Typ. IV, 48.

⁴² Pachymeres, II, 289-290. Nikephoros Choumnos later wrote that Andronikos and Irene loved his daughter, and treated her as their own child; one has no way of knowing whether Irene of Montferrat was, in fact, reconciled, or whether Choumnos was improving on reality: J. Fr. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiis*, I (Paris, 1829), 289-299.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 293; Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, V, 184, 335.

dora Synadene appended to her typikon portraits of members of her family in rich and majestic garb. While the introduction of the typikon for the convent of Lips is missing, its founder, Theodora, referred to herself as “ἡ βασιλεία μου” in the body of the text.⁴⁴

This rather secular pride in family and titulature is further developed in the introductions to the various typika, in which the foundress habitually described herself and her family, and her good fortune in earthly matters. Irene Doukaina mentioned that she had achieved the highest among human distinctions, the office of Empress, and that she had come to it not only through her husband, but through her own family, her mother (Maria of Bulgaria) as well as her father (Andronikos Doukas).⁴⁵ Her husband's successes in war she discussed as though she too had had a part in them; as, indeed, according to her daughter she had, especially in Alexios' later years, when she accompanied him in battle and, says Anna, was always on the alert for conspiracies against him.⁴⁶ Her insistence on lineage was not unique to her; it was a phenomenon increasingly common after the eleventh century, which reached a climax in the great families of the Palaiologan period. Michael Attaleiates, in the *diataxis* for his *ptochotropheion*, had to acknowledge that he had arrived in Constantinople in poor circumstances and there, he says with pride, had become one of the Senate and of those whom people called «aristokratikous.»⁴⁷ But he was living at the end of the period where this social mobility was possible and positively viewed. Already in the eleventh century, Micael Psellos went to

⁴⁴ Typ., II, p.114.

⁴⁵ Typ.I, 996.

⁴⁶ *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, XII, 3, XIV, 4-5.

⁴⁷ Miklosich-Müller, *Acta*, V, 293-294. Cf. P. Lemerle, “La diataxis de Michel Attaliat (mars 1077)”, in *Cinq études*, no. II.

some pains to boast of his father's aristocratic lineage, and of his wife's connection to the imperial family.⁴⁸ After that, the typika of monasteries as well as nunneries are full of references to the founder's aristocratic origins. Thus, the typikon of Michael VIII for the monastery of St. Michael, on Mt. Auxentius, mentions the founder's imperial descent.⁴⁹

The typikon of Theodora Synadene is almost too proud a recital of noble birth. In her long introduction she dwells, as Irene Doukaina had done, on the things of the earthly life which had been hers and which she had enjoyed. It becomes quite clear that what she most cherished was her aristocratic origins: her parents were "illustrious of birth", rich, and had achieved high office. Of her mother (Irene Komnene Branaina Palaiologina) she says that her golden ancestry was the Branas, that glorious and renowned race, and that she surpassed other women as her father surpassed other men, the latter statement being something of a *topos*. Theodora also mentioned her husband's illustrious birth.⁵⁰ Theodora's convent was built as a family retreat, for it was intended primarily for her daughter, who was from an early age dedicated to religion. She is referred to by the name Euphrosyne Komnene Doukaina Palaiologina.⁵¹ As for the typikon of the Empress Theodora, its beginning is missing, and therefore we do not know in what terms she discussed her family and her earthly life.

A profound sense of family solidarity and family loyalty emanates from the most complete of the typika, and is evident primarily in the provisions which refer to the commemoration of various family members. Theodora Synadene provided with great care for the commemoration of her relatives on the dates of their respective

⁴⁸ K. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, V (Venice, 1876), 63: «βασιλικῶν γὰρ αἰμάτων ῥανίδες ταύτην διέπλαττον».

⁴⁹ A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgiceskih rukopisej*, vol. I, *Typika* (Kiev, 1895, reprinted 1965), 770: «καθ' αἷμα καὶ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν περιφανέσιν ἐκείνοις καὶ μεγάλοις βασιλεῦσιν ᾤκειωσε».

⁵⁰ Delehay, "Deux typica," pp. 22-26.

⁵¹ Delehay, "Deux typica," pp. 22, 14; cf. pp. 146-154. 'deux typica,' pp. 22-26.

deaths. First she mentioned her parents, then her husband and herself, followed by her brothers, sisters, sister-in-law, grandchildren etc. They are all mentioned with their full names and titles, and most of them had assumed the monastic habit before dying, an interesting comment on piety at the time of the Palaiologoi. In similar manner, Irene Doukaina specified in a very detailed fashion the commemoration of her family dead, with gradations of treatment depending on her feelings for each member of the family, or on other factors which are not entirely clear. Her great affection for her daughter Anna is obvious from the fact that only one grandchild, the younger Irene Doukaina (Anna's daughter), is mentioned, and even appears before all the daughters and daughters-in-law. Irene's sense of sex-specific propriety is perhaps manifested by the fact that her sons and sons-in-law appear before her daughters, although not all of the sons-in-law are mentioned.⁵² The family solidarity expressed here is in the first instance connected with class, not with sex. Thus, similar commemorative lists may be found in the typikon of John II Komnenos for the monastery of Pantokrator, and in the typikon of Michael VIII for St. Michael's on Mt. Auxentius, which provides for commemorative services for one pair of his grandparents and for his parents, all of whom had assumed the habit.⁵³

The convents under discussion functioned, to some extent, as retreats for the female members of the family. All of the typika (except for IV) make provisions for the case in which the female relations of the foundress should desire to enter the convent. Irene Doukaina wished her foundation to allow any of the female descendants of her daughters Anna and Maria to enter it as nuns. Not only that: should they prove unable entirely to abandon their customary way of life and adapt to the harsher monastic attitudes, they were to be given special privileges. Although her typikon (as all foundation

⁵² Typ.I, ch. 72. On the hierarchy, cf. Ch. Diehl, *Figures byzantines*, II (Paris, 1909), 81ff.

⁵³ Gautier, "Typikon," 41ff; idem, "L'obituaire du Typikon de Pantocrator," *Revue des études byzantines*, 27 (1969), 235-236, or Michael VIII's typikon: cf. Dmitrievskij, *Typika*, pp. 786-788.

charters of the *koinobla*) insists on the importance of the common table, these ladies were to be allowed to eat in their own cells. They were also allowed two servants each, and, significantly, the same provisions were to apply to women other than the imperial progeny, who belonged to the great families.⁵⁴

During her lifetime, Irene Doukaina built next to the convent some more elegant (“πολυτελέστερα”) buildings, where she and her daughter Anna occupied rooms. Here they lived with their servants, male and female. The complex was clearly a spacious one, having two courtyards, within which a vineyard was included. The outer court apparently included buildings which might later be rented out, whereas the inner court was large enough for Irene to say that it might in the future be turned into gardens and truck gardens, whose income would enrich the convent. This complex was to belong to Anna Komnene and, after her, to Anna’s daughter, Irene Doukaina, and subsequently to Anna Komnene’s relatives by blood or marriage. It is quite clear that the hierarchies which existed in society were to a significant extent preserved in the convent, and in monasteries in general.⁵⁵

Irene Choumnaina’s extant typikon did not discuss her own position or that of other upper class women. We do know, however, that she lived in the convent, which she ruled with an iron hand, whereas after a few years her parents also retired to the two parts of her double monastery. Her foundation was intended from the beginning to provide for her own retirement from the world.⁵⁶ In the convent of Lips, the life of the nuns proceeded along lines similar to those established by Irene Doukaina for Kecharitomene. The Empress Theodora wished all the nuns to live under the same régime,

⁵⁴ Typ.I, ch. 4. In the eleventh century, it appears to have been common for ladies of means to have servants in the nunnery. Michael Psellos’ mother had at least two servants with her, although, admittedly, before she assumed the greater habit: Sathas, *op.cit.*, p.45.

⁵⁵ Typ.I, ch.79; cf. A.P. Každan, “Vizantijskih monastir XI-XII vv. kak sotsial’naja gruppa,” *Viz. Vrem.*, n.s., 13 (1971), 62-64.

⁵⁶ Laurent, “Princesse,” 44-47; cf. Theodore Hyrtakenos, in Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, I, 287.

stating that the differences in their lives in the world should not influence their life in the convent. Nevertheless, she did make special provisions for her daughters and granddaughters. Each of her daughters was to be allowed food equivalent to the share of four nuns, presumably to provide for the keep of the three servants that each of them could have. Other imperial relatives were allowed one servant, and provisions equivalent to the share of two nuns. Similarly, Theodora Synadene counselled the superior of her convent to treat with some gentleness the nuns who belonged to the upper class, as she would sick nuns. The ladies of good family who entered her convent were allowed a servant, if they needed one.⁵⁷

The convents under discussion, conceived as family foundations, were furthermore expected to remain under the general supervision (ἐφορεία) of members of the foundress' family. All of these convents were independent (αὐτοδέσποτα), with the proviso that supervision, especially over secular matters, should reside in the family of the foundress. Within this general framework, details varied. Irene Doukaina was the most fiercely attached to her family, both her ancestors and her descendants. She was also the foundress who most insisted on keeping her convent out of contact with men, at almost every level. During her lifetime, she kept the government of the convent in her own hands; her husband, she wrote, shared this authority, although her statement concerning him seems like an afterthought. After their death, the supervision of the convent was originally to devolve to Irene's daughter, the nun Eudokia, and subsequently to those female descendants whom Irene intended to designate either in an addition to the typikon or in her testament. After Eudokia's death, Irene did, in fact, write an addition to the typikon, giving the *ephoreia* to her daughter Anna Komnene, and after her to her other daughter Maria, acting together with Anna's daughter, Irene Doukaina. After their death, it would pass down the female line to Anna Komnene's female descendants. Should

⁵⁷ Typ. II, chapters 13, 17; Typ. V., ch. 18.

the female line to Anna Komnene's female descendants. Should the female line (ἡ σειρά τοῦ θήλεος γένους) die out, the provident, meticulous Empress indicated that the supervision should go to the oldest of Anna Komnene's daughters-in-law, assuming that she did not remarry, if widowed. Finally, if there were no more spouses of Anna Komnene's male descendants, the *ephoreia* would pass into the hands of one of the most illustrious (ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιφανεστέρων) of Irene's lateral female relatives (not necessarily the oldest one), who would be chosen by the nuns and their abbess.⁵⁸

It is to be noted that the *ephoreia* does not leave the family of Irene Doukaina, and that it is carried down through the female line, and only to females. It is, perhaps, proof of the same strong sense of identity through the female line that Irene Doukaina's favorite granddaughter, although she was the granddaughter of a Komnenos and the daughter of the Caesar Nikephoros Vryennios, himself not a man of humble origins, should be known by the family name of her maternal grandmother. For purposes of comparison, it may be mentioned that in the eleventh century Michael Attaleiates had stated that if his male line died out, his female descendants could become *ephoroi* of his foundation. However, that foundation had a specific role to play as a secure and privileged source of family income.⁵⁹ Therefore, his motives in granting its supervision to his female descendants were fundamentally different from those of Irene Doukaina, whose convent was not envisaged as a source of revenue for the family.

The fourteenth-century typika of the Empress Theodora and Theodora Synadene show no particular predilection for the female line, as far as the *ephoreia* of the convents is concerned. On the contrary, Synadene claimed that the weakness of female nature makes it imperative that supervision be exercised by a man; and she chose for that position her eldest surviving son and his male succes-

⁵⁸ Typ. I, chapters 1, 3, 80. The *ephoros* of the female convent of Areia would be the superior of the male foundation: Miklosich-Müller, *Acta*, V, 179; on "independent" monastic foundations, see Janin, "Monachisme," 34-36.

⁵⁹ Lemerle, *Cinq études*, no. II; Miklosich-Müller, *Acta*, V, 301.

sors. The Empress Theodora, predictably perhaps, chose her son, the Emperor Andronikos II, claiming that the nuns had to have the strongest possible protector because of their weakness, and because of the fact that, as women, they were particularly to be kept away from secular concerns.⁶⁰ These sentiments concerning the infirmity of women, which were expressed in very similar terms by these two relatives, seem to be pious commonplaces. Neither the other provisions of the typika, nor what we know of the life in the cloister of another foundress, Irene Choumnaina, bear out the myth of female weakness.

The ecclesiastical provisions of the typika, which at a cursory examination appear ordinary and not significantly distinguishable from those of male foundations, will not concern us here. On the other hand, the chapters concerning the administration of the convents are of great importance. They are among the very few extant sources which allow us to examine the concern of aristocratic women with administrative and economic matters, and the degree to which these ladies were, or considered themselves to be, competent in dealing with them.

Once again, the typikon of Irene Doukaina is the most important. Administrative provisions were very carefully set out. She described in minute detail the various offices, the duties of the nuns who held them, and the way in which these duties should be carried out. Nothing was left unclear; no detail was overlooked, as a very strong-willed and capable woman tried to ensure that everything in her convent would be run her own way, even after her death. The administrative clauses in her typikon have their parallels in other

typika of the Comnenian period, specifically those of Pantokrator (1136), Elegmon (Eliou Vomon) (1162), and Kosmosoteira (1152).⁶¹ Her son John's typikon for Pantokrator was very carefully drawn up, and had detailed provisions concerning the administration of the xenon of the monastery. The typikon for Kosmosoteira, too, issued by another of her sons, had interesting administrative provisions; but it was not nearly as detailed as that of Irene and it was, of course, issued much later than hers. While all of these typika had some connection with earlier ones, especially with the foundation charter for Theotokos Evergetis, issued in 1054, nevertheless, the differences between them are significant; and Irene Doukaina's typikon is the most detailed of any of them insofar as administration is concerned. On the other hand, the typikon for Kosmosoteira contains many more details about contact with peasants, soldiers, villagers, in short, with the outside world. In that sense, the male monastery, at least in the twelfth century, was more of a public institution than was the female one.⁶²

Two important characteristics of the dispositions of Irene's typikon are her desire to avoid, as much as possible, contact between the nuns and the male world, and the fact that she assumed, in the various nuns who held office, a great degree of personal responsibility and competence. In her desire to avoid contact with the male world, she went to the extreme of stipulating that virtually all the males with whom the nuns had to associate be eunuchs; the two priests, the confessor, the *oikonomos*, the doctor (although in his case she would compromise for an old man who was not a eunuch).⁶³

⁶¹ For the typikon of Elegmon, see Dmitrievskij, *Typika*, 715-769; for the typikon of Kosmosoteira, see L. Petit, "Le typikon de Kosmosotira (1152)," *Izvestija Russk. Archeol. Instituta v Konstantinopel*, XIII (1908), 17-75; cf. Kurtz, in *BZ*, XVI (1907), 101-107.

⁶² For the typikon of Evergetis, see Dmitrievskij, *Typika*, 615-656; cf. J. Pargoire, "Constantinople: Le couvent de l'Evergètès," *Echos d'Orient*, 9 (1906), 228-232, 366-73; 10 (1907), 155-167, 259-263; Janin, *Géographie*, 186-191.

⁶³ Typ. I, chapters 15, 16, 57; cf. Janin, "Monachisme," p. 37, n. 75.

In the convent of Kecharitomene, as in all monasteries, the *oikonomos* held the most important financial office. In general terms, his duty was to administer the monastery's property, especially the estates, to collect the rents and incomes, and maintain the property. In the specific case of the *oikonomos* of Kecharitomene, his main job was to oversee the estates, to ensure that the convent did not lose income through neglect or malfeasance, to arrange for the transport (sometimes by ship) of the crops to the convent, and to bring in the cash income; he also had to take care of the buildings of the convent. This very important official was, in the convent of Kecharitomene, a man, as was the case in all other convents, with one exception.⁶⁴ Irene herself had appointed the first *oikonomos*; after her death, he was to be appointed by the superior, who stood at the head of the internal hierarchy of the convent. There is no doubt that Irene also supervised the man very closely; and she insisted that after her death the superior would have the first and last word on the economic affairs of the convent. The *oikonomos* was simply to execute her orders ("κατ'ἐπιτροπήν"), hand the yearly income over to her, and show her the accounts of those who held land from or owed rent to the convent. It is, I think, indicative of Irene's meticulous concern with administration, and of her desire to control the economic aspects of the convent, that her typikon contains by far the most detailed provisions concerning the *oikonomos*; neither the typikon for Kosmosoteira, nor that for Elegmon, nor their model, the typikon for Evergetis, contain such details. Even the typikon for Pantokrator, which shows just as much interest in detail as does that of Irene, reserves it primarily to the discussion of the affairs of the hospital attached to the monastery.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ In the convent of Areia, too, the *oikonomos* was a man, but he was not the superior of the male foundation, as suggests Janin, "Monachisme," 41; see Miklosich-Müller, *Acta*, V, 179.

⁶⁵ Typ.I, ch.14; cf. Gautier, "Typikon," 83ff.

A number of other officials dealt, in one way or another, with matters of an economic nature in the convent of Kecharitomene. A relatively small convent (Irene suggested the number of 24-30 nuns, with a possible maximum of 40), it had eight nuns who dealt with administrative and economic matters. One was the *skeuofylakissa* and *chartofylakissa*, who was in charge of the movable property and of the charters of the convent. She was, by necessity, able to read, write and reckon, since she had to keep detailed accounts of receipts and expenses, preserve all the records, and make certain that all charters or other documents which left her charge returned to it. Like all other nuns in a position of responsibility, she received and transmitted by written documents all the items pertaining to her charge. Of contemporary typika, only that of Nikephoros for Elegmon has provisions very similar to those given by Irene with regard to the *chartofylakissa*; this part of his typikon is certainly not modelled on Evergetis, but may be modelled on Kecharitomene.⁶⁶

The two most important offices, after that of the *chartofylakissa*, were those of the two treasurers, who, in Kecharitomene, were both called *docheiariai*, but whose functions differed, since one was in charge of the cash, and the other in charge of clothing. The *oikonomos* was responsible for bringing the cash income to the convent; there, he handed it over to the superior and the treasurer, and got a receipt. From then on, the money became the responsibility of the *docheiaria*, who entered the income in her account book. Irene was extremely careful about the details of bookkeeping, which means not only that she was interested in preserving honesty among the treasurers, but also that she herself knew well how to keep books. For example, when it was necessary to spend money, the treasurer, at the bidding of the superior, would do so, entering the expenditure in a small account book, in the presence of the second treasurer. This detailed account was then checked by the superior, and the expenses were entered into another book (ἐν ἰδιάζοντι κοντακίῳ), which was placed in the treasury and sealed.

⁶⁶ Cf. Typ.I, ch. 19; typikon for Kosmoteira, ch. 36, and typikon for Elegmon, ch.9.

Other typika also mentioned the two treasurers and defined their duties, which did not differ in essence from those discussed above. But for the most part they did not insist on the details, as did Irene and the typikon for Elegmon.⁶⁷

The two *ergodotriai* were responsible for the productive activities of the nuns. They received from the treasurer in charge of the vestuary raw materials, which they gave to the nuns; they also gave the finished product to the treasurers. All of this was done in writing, and accompanied by receipts. As for the productive activity alluded to here, there is no doubt that it consisted of cloth-making, whether that meant weaving, or sewing, or both. This is clear from the fact that the *ergodotriai* dealt only with the nun in charge of the vestuary. *Ergocheiron* here means cloth-making, as it does in the typikon of Michael VIII, and in the typikon of Nilos Damilas.⁶⁸

Among the administrative officers there were also the wine-stewardess, in charge of the wine drunk in the convent, and the *oreiaria* who received and disposed of all crops and legumes, at the abbess' command. There was, finally, the *diakonitria*, who kept close account of the food entering the monastery, and of the way it was used. Like all of the others, she had to keep detailed accounts of everything passing through her hands. Even the *ekkleksiarchissa*, although not strictly speaking a financial officer, received from the *skeuofylakissa*, presumably at the beginning of her term, those vessels necessary for the celebration of the holy office in the church, and gave a receipt.⁶⁹

It is absolutely clear from the *typikon*, that the nuns responsible for the handling of any property whatsoever must have known how to read, write and keep accounts. The treasurer and the superior had to be quite proficient at these skills. This was especially true of the superior, who had ultimate authority over the internal as well as the external affairs of the convent. It is also quite striking that Irene

⁶⁷ Cf. Typ. I, ch. 24; Elegmon, ch. 10; Typ. V, ch. 11; and Michael VIII's typikon for St. Michael's in Dmitrievskij, *Typika*, p. 782.

⁶⁸ Typ. I, ch. 27; Typ. VI, pp. 102-103; Dmitrievskij, *Typika*, p. 782.

⁶⁹ Typ. I, chapters 20-23.

made no provisions for the possibility of nuns being appointed to these offices who could not deal with the matters at hand. She seems absolutely confident that among the capable nuns of her convent there would be a sufficient number who possessed the required skills. Her son Isaac, on the contrary, when he drew up the typikon for Kosmosoteira, differentiated between literate and illiterate officers.⁷⁰

In her provisions regarding the alienation of monastic property, Irene Doukaina followed tradition and precedent. Like other founders, she absolutely forbade the alienation of lands. She allowed the sale of some movable property, only in the case where the convent had suffered grave damage from some extraordinary event such as an invasion, an earthquake, or a fire. The same provisions may be found in the typikon for Evergetis, from which the equivalent clauses of the typika of Kecharitomene and Kosmosoteira seem to derive.⁷¹ But, characteristically, Irene inserted a passage in which she explained the thinking behind this policy. She defended the practice of restoring immovable property through the sale of movable assets, by saying that the convent had much more to gain from the revenues of landed property. Therefore, she wrote, while it is difficult to restore immovable goods from movable ones, if one holds on to landed property it is possible to recover the movable goods once alienated. This is the thinking and the attitude of a conservative landlord.

The economic policies of Irene Doukaina in regard to her convent were very conservative, as was generally the case with monastic property. Her aim was to preserve the convent's wealth, and even to increase it. But the increased income the convent might

⁷⁰ Petit, "Kosmosotira," ch.39.

⁷¹ Typ.I, ch.10; Typ. II, ch. 19; typikon for Evergetis, ch. 19; Petit, "Kosmosotira," ch. 45.

any case, the paramount position of the superior is established in the typika of the various convents. This is particularly the case with the typikon of Irene Doukaina, who took great care to ensure that the superior would be in full control of the convent. Thus, the economic administration of the convent's property was, in the first instance, in the hands of the *oikonomos* who, being a man, was able to go out in the world and consort with men. It was, therefore, his duty to visit the estates and the city property, and to supervise the overseers. But he then had to submit, once a year, the accounts of the tenants to the superior, who checked them and decided whether they were acceptable. It was also the superior, together with the steward, who chose the overseers of the estates, to be well-respected and not greedy men, experienced in agricultural matters, who would neither burden the peasants unduly, nor embezzle monastic funds. While it was the duty of the *oikonomos* to supervise them, it was the right of the superior to appoint them, and to change them if she did not approve of their behavior.⁷⁵

The superior, then, of a large imperial foundation, was expected to be not only a pious and wise woman, but one of great worldly experience and steeped in the world of land management. Presumably, she was a great lady who had already had in her own household the experience of dealing with stewards and overseers, and of closely supervising every expense and every item entering the household. She also had to be a lady of great presence, for Irene gave to her the ultimate word for every important policy or action that affected the convent. The very autocratic structure of authority in the monastery reflects, to some extent, Irene's own character, best epitomized in her own emphatic words: "ὁ γὰρ βούλομαι, σφόδρα βούλομαι."⁷⁶

⁷⁵ Typ.I, chapters 14, 15, 31.

⁷⁶ Typ.I, col.1076.

The twelfth-century upper class lady has left us a clear imprint in this document: she is powerful, intelligent, learned to a greater or lesser degree, a manager, an economic conservative. She has great pride of birth, and a great concern for her family; she is fully conscious of her privileged position, and does not quite relinquish it when she enters religion. She is austere, strict, not overly ascetic, and has a complex relationship with men. This is attested by Irene's very strict provisions concerning visitation rights to the nuns, or visits by the nuns to their families. The insistence on cloistering which extends to the extreme position of having only eunuchs enter the convent, has been noted by other scholars. It may have been a reaction to the rather lax conditions of the eleventh century, at which time Michael Psellos was able to visit his mother at a convent, without any difficulties.⁷⁷

The fourteenth-century typika have many points of similarity with the typikon for Kecharitomene, but also present some new elements. For one thing, life in a fourteenth-century convent appears to have been less strict and less constricting than it was in the twelfth-century foundation. This is evident in the typika for Lips (II) and Vevaia Elpis (V). Neither the Empress Theodora nor her niece was as insistent as Irene had been that all men entering the convent be eunuchs. Indeed, such a possibility appears only in the typikon for Agioi Anargyroi (III). Furthermore, the convent of Lips, with its hospital, had as its *ephoros* a man, the ruling emperor, and the ephoros was allowed, along with a number of his nobles, to visit the monastery—something forbidden in Irene Doukaina's typikon. True, these were the only men allowed inside—along with a few others who might wish to visit the graves of relatives buried in the monastery, who would also necessarily be upper class men. Nevertheless, there is a strong impression of some

⁷⁷ Sathas, *op.cit.*, pp.37, 45, 46, 48; Diehl, *Figures byzantines*, II, 68; Janin, "Monachisme," 37.

laxity in the relations between the sexes. It may be that we are dealing primarily with increased visitation rights of the upper class, which affected male foundations as well. Thus, Michael VIII forbade all visits by women to his monastery of St. Michael, or to its church; but an exception was made for «δέσποιναι εὐσεβεῖς, καὶ προσγενίδες τῶν φιλοχρίστων βασιλέων.»⁷⁸

In Theodora Synadene's convent also, neither the priest nor the confessor were expected to be eunuchs; and the provisions for the financial administration of the foundation make it clear that there was some contact between men and a few of the nuns. This was the only convent in which the *oikonomos*, the main financial officer, was a woman, not a man. Her duties, very much like those outlined by Irene Doukaina for the (male) steward of *her* monastery, were set out in detail by Theodora, and leave no doubt as to the qualifications necessary to the nun who held the office. The first qualification, which Theodora herself pointed out, was that she must be greatly experienced in financial matters, so as to preserve the possessions of the convent and not allow them to decline. She would, of course, leave the monastery when her duties made it necessary. She would visit the estates, demand the accounts of the overseers of the estates, and correct those who had not discharged their duties properly. She was in charge of all the income of the convent and of all crops from the monastic estates. She would supervise the arrival of crops at the convent, and see that they were placed in the proper granaries by the nuns in charge; she would demand from these nuns minute accounts, and submit all accounts to the superior and her council of nuns. She was also in charge of the cash income, which she handed over to the abbess, and of the internal economic life of the monastery. This nun, who obviously should know reading, writing and some form of accounting, was, it is certain, in daily contact both with men and with secular matters. The provisions concerning the other administrative and financial officers are unremarkable, except that it is clear that they all had to know reading, writing and

⁷⁸ Dmitrievskij, *Typika*, 787.

reckoning, in order to be able to present their accounts to the *hegoumene*, who supervised everything.⁷⁹

Similar provisions governed the administration of the convent of Lips. The *oikonomos* was, to be sure, a man (he could be a eunuch), who drew a salary. He had assistants, and discharged the usual duties of supervising the estates, the buildings, and the hospital which was attached to the convent. The duties of the other officers are the same as in other convents.⁸⁰ In less aristocratic convents, the nuns seem to have been less independent as far as the administration of the affairs of the foundation were concerned. The founder of the convent of Areia wrote that the abbot of the male foundation could supervise the *oikonomos*, if the nuns wished it. In the fourteenth century, Nilos Damilas was concerned that the nuns of his convent not have too much commerce with monks; he therefore ordered that the affairs of the convent should be conducted through laymen («διὰ λαϊκῶν ἐναρέτων»), and not through monks.⁸¹

The fourteenth-century typika are also much more explicit than was that of Irene Doukaina about social divisions between the nuns in the convent—a phenomenon connected with the fact that these convents were less isolated from the rest of society than Irene had wished hers to be. Typika II and V differentiated between those nuns whose labor was specifically spiritual, i.e. the *ekklesiastikai*,

⁷⁹ Typ.V, chapters 7,11; on the duties of a thirteenth-century *oikonomos*, see the typikon of Michael VIII for St. Michael's: he should be a man of great experience in secular matters, wise, and loyal. He had the duty of supervising the peasants, the workers in the vineyards, the shepherds and oxherds; he gave them orders and supervised their performance. He would, with the agreement of the superior, choose laymen or ecclesiastics as overseers of the estates (Dmitrievskij, *Typika*, 781).

⁸⁰ Typ.II, chapters 12, 13; on the *paroikonomos*, cf. Typ.I, ch. 14, and Gautier, "Typikon", 61.

⁸¹ Miklosich-Müller, *Acta*, V, 179; Typ.VI, 102-103.

and those who performed other jobs: «ἐν ταῖς σωματικωτέραις διακονίαις». The proportion was fixed as 30:20 in typikon II and 18:12 in typikon III.⁸² In the convent restored by Irene Choumnaina, physical labor appears to have been limited to particular nuns, although Nikephoros Gregoras praised the foundress for doing some of the vilest jobs herself. Certainly, her spiritual advisor, Theoleptos of Philadelpheia, urged her to visit the sick sisters and, if possible, nurse them herself.⁸³

It is not clear exactly what labor the working nuns performed. Theodora Synadene mentions their *ergocheiron* which apparently they could do within the monastery, since she forbade them to engage in it and pray at the same time. But it appears that the working nuns also worked outside the convent, since they could go to church only after they had finished their labor and returned to the convent. It is clear that their work was manual.⁸⁴ Perhaps they engaged in some kind of agricultural labor; or, perhaps, Irene Choumnaina provides a clue as to the type of work they did, when in her *typikon* she forbade the nuns to engage in manual labor (*ergocheiron*) on their own account (as opposed to the common labor, which all the nuns performed together). In the same passage, she exhorted them to live as behooves nuns, and not behave like retail traders (πραγματευτρίας). This, taken together with the fact that *ergocheiron* refers to cloth-making in typikon I, suggests that there was cloth production in Byzantine nunneries, and that sometimes nuns sent their own production to the market.

⁸² Typ. V, p.51; Typ.II, ch.3; Typ.III, p.139.

⁸³ Gregoras, III, 239; Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, letter no. 25, fo. 233 vo (I have followed the folio numbers written in Arabic numerals; there is also a different and earlier pagination noted in Greek numerals).

⁸⁴ Typ.V, p.51. The typikon for Pantokrator also mentions monks who engaged in manual labor: the *douleutai*, 30 out of 80 monks, served as bakers, cooks, and gardeners for the community; four of them served the other monks, washed their clothes, helped them in their bath, and watched over the sick. They also served as assistants to the monastic officers (Gautier, *Typikon*, pp. 61-63). It is assumed that in nunneries, too, the working nuns served as cooks, etc.

The working nuns mentioned in typikon V were, or, rather, may have been, illiterate. This is, in fact, the only time that the possibility of illiteracy is raised in these typika.⁸⁵ This, and the fact that Theodora Synadene was clearly talking down to the working nuns when she addressed them in her charter,⁸⁶ suggests that the working nuns were recruited among a class distinctly lower than that of the ecclesiastical nuns; that class distinctions, in other words, far from being blurred, were reproduced in the convent.

The involvement of nuns in the affairs of the world in the Palaiologan period is further indicated by the fact that the convents served as schools, both for young girls who were to become nuns, and for lay children. Even in the humble convent of Damilas, in Crete, girls under 10 years of age, accepted with their mothers, would be taught the (sacred) letters in preparation for monastic life, and before being taught any other trade.⁸⁷ In the aristocratic convent of Theodora Synadene, the *ekklesiarchissa* was in charge of those girls who were fully occupied with learning the sacred letters and chanting. But the convent also had a school to which lay children, *boys and girls*, went to learn their letters. The daughter of the foundress, Euphrosyne, who had been dedicated to God at an early age and was, perhaps as a consequence, a rather uncompromising individual, found that this situation created grave dangers to the souls of the nuns, who were not sufficiently isolated from the world, and became confused because of too frequent contact with laymen. She therefore suppressed the school, although she left intact the business of teaching the sacred letters to girls who would eventually enter the convent.⁸⁸ The convent of Christos Philanthropos also had facilities for the education of young girls, at least those

⁸⁵ Typ. IV, pp. 48-49.

⁸⁶ Typ. V, p. 53.

⁸⁷ Typ. VI, p. 100.

⁸⁸ Typ. V, pp. 47, 97-98.

rife was it with jealousies and disputes, at least according to the writings of Theoleptos of Philadelphia. But even his ideas of cloistering, strict as they were, seem lax when compared to those of Irene Doukaina. For he advised the nuns of Christos Philanthropos to visit the prisoners, to nurse the sick, and to help those who lived too much in the world, by showing them how to leave it. It was advice whose social usefulness is undoubted, but which could not be followed except by nuns who occasionally left the convent. Only once in the course of his lengthy correspondence with Irene Choumnaina and his sermons to her nuns did he castigate a nun for leaving the convent; but that was because her purpose was bad, and she left secretly.⁹³ All the sources suggest that the nunnery of the Palaiologan period was the last place of habitation of various individuals, rather than a true retreat from the world.

The realities of life in a fourteenth-century convent are nowhere more clearly evident than in the life of Irene Choumnaina, the foundress of Christos Philanthropos. Irene was an imperious woman. Perhaps she was brought up by her parents to be proud, and to expect to have her way; at least, that is the impression one gets from the writings of her father, Nikephoros Choumnos, who describes in detail the loving care and attention her parents showered upon her. Her pride was undoubtedly reinforced by her imperial marriage, even if, as Choumnos says (somewhat disingenuously), that was an honor un hoped for by her family. Widowed at sixteen, she soon thereafter restored the convent of which she was to be the *hegoumene*; but she never forgot the dignity to which she had attained, and never did she use her father's family name. She signed herself, and was addressed as, "Palaiologina", and her father frequently addressed her as "my empress".⁹⁴ Her spiritual

⁹³ Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr.405, letter no.19, fo. 171ro; letter no.25, 229ro.

⁹⁴ Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, I, 294-295, 293; idem, *Anecdota Nova* (Paris, 1844), 181. On Irene's marriage, cf. also the Monody of Theodore Yrtakenos, in Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, I, 286.

father, Theoleptos, found it useful, in his early letters, to mingle his counsel with comparisons from her life at court: he told her to approach God as she would the Emperor, with her entire body, soul, and attention, so as to incur His benevolence.⁹⁵ In the same letter, he told her that she had to rule over her passions as she had reigned in the world.

Her position in the convent tended to strengthen these character traits, despite the frequent admonitions of her confessor. She expected complete obedience and, indeed, as *hegoumene* she was entitled to it. Time and again, Theoleptos advised her to rule the convent wisely, and the nuns to obey her. The foundations of the monastic house, he said, were submission and obedience to the superior. While submission was a virtue he preached to Irene also, in the case of the other nuns it was to be exercised with regard to her.⁹⁶ Apparently, she did not always get full obedience, for Theoleptos had to be firm on the point. She was, undoubtedly, an extreme personality. Theoleptos discusses with severity the case of a young nun, whom Irene herself had persuaded to enter the convent and whom she cast away from her, as soon as the young nun displeased her. It seems from his letter that the young nun was guilty of disobedience, for he cautioned Irene that if she were to punish her further, she, Irene, would fall victim to the passion of love of self (*filautia*).⁹⁷ It seems, too, that Irene had, on occasion, struck nuns who would not obey her.⁹⁸ Her pride was easily wounded, particularly when she did not receive the respect to which she felt she was entitled, both by her nuns and by people outside the convent.⁹⁹ She was also, as must be evident from the circumstances

⁹⁵ Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, fo.8ro, 10vo-20ro.

⁹⁶ Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, fo. 94ro-97vo, 137ro-142vo.

⁹⁷ Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, letter no. 25, fo.224ro.

⁹⁸ Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, fo. 228vo.

⁹⁹ Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, letter no.26.

surrounding the case of the young nun, capable of violent attachments. Theoleptos had to be extremely strict with her so that she would not carry out her design to join him, when he left Constantinople to reside in his see at Philadelpheia. Only, it seems, the threat that he would not communicate with her again put an end to that design.¹⁰⁰

In the eyes of her confessor, Irene's greatest shortcoming was that she never entirely left the world. In his very first letter, written, I think, just after she had become a nun, he admonished her to stop frequenting the palace, to give up her many servants, to flee from flattery.¹⁰¹ In his second letter, he praised her for her decision to enter monastic life, but cautioned her that her commitment must be absolute. She should truly abandon her parents, friends and relatives, and devote herself completely to Christ. He urged her to leave the world and its cares, and admitted that the memory of worldly matters is very strong, and should be as firmly resisted.¹⁰² Later, after she certainly had become a nun, he said that the people around her were still trying to lure her back into worldly cares: «οὐκ ἡσυχάζουσιν οἱ κοσμοκράτορες τῶν ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ προσηλωμένων· ὀπίσω σου δὲ καταδιώκουσι κρατερῶς.»¹⁰³

He listed the things which may prove dangerous to those who truly want to flee the world, and cautioned her against them. In his eyes, she had not herself achieved true disengagement from the world: he told her that once that happened, she would really come to love the solitude of the convent. His advice, however, was clearly not heeded; most of his letters to her return to the same theme.

¹⁰⁰ Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, fo. 233ro-vo, 243ro, 244ro-245vo.

¹⁰¹ Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, fo. 6 ff; cf. Salaville, "Une lettre", 105 ff.

¹⁰² Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, letter no.2.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, no.4, fo. 59vo.

On one occasion, he explained to her the meaning of the creation of Eve, in order to suggest that through her creation God prepared the way for the miracle of salvation, for which one must prepare by abandoning the world.¹⁰⁴ Near the end of his life, when he was in Philadelphieia, and many years after Irene had assumed the habit, he still accused her of being close to her parents and other relatives and friends, of being dissatisfied with her position as nun: «Τί σοι λείπεται καὶ ἀγανακτεῖς; Τίνος ὑστερεῖ καὶ δυσχεραίνεις;» What she lacked, he thought, was the closeness of her parents, the flattery of her friends, the full enjoyment of her property.¹⁰⁵

Irene had, in fact, not separated herself from the cares of this world. Her father claimed that she saw people only on Saturdays and Sundays; but on those days she certainly learned the news of Constantinople, and discussed worldly matters like litigation.¹⁰⁶ In the mid-1320s, more than ten years since she had entered the convent, she was lauded for seeking the company of men learned in philosophy, and had books sent to her by friends.¹⁰⁷ She was deeply involved in the Hesychast controversy on the side of the anti-Palamists, and it appears that she suffered for it.¹⁰⁸ She may, indeed, be one of the Constantinopolitan ladies to whom the Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos referred rather bitterly: "those superficial and empty-headed women, whom Constantinople breeds in

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, nos. 5, 24.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, fo. 237ro.

¹⁰⁶ Boissonade, *Anecdota Nova*, 181-182; cf. Laurent, "Une princesse," 53.

¹⁰⁷ D. Reinsch, *Die Briefe des Matthaios von Ephesos im Codex Vindobonensis Theol. Gr. 174* (Berlin, 1974), letter B 32.

¹⁰⁸ Gregoras, III, 238-240.

large numbers, who add to their supposed nobility vacuousness and a schismatic predilection, and who ... have the ambition of building around them a following, and acquiring fame and an unbecoming name.”¹⁰⁹

A person who entered a monastery in theory abandoned all of his or her worldly possessions; *akteмосyne* was one of the first monastic virtues. Irene Choumnaina herself insisted, in her *typikon*, that nuns have no personal possessions. In his laudatory discussion of her Gregoras was content to make Irene conform to the rule: after she became widowed, he said, she gave all her property to the poor, except for that portion of it which she used to endow her convent.¹¹⁰ In reality, however, Irene preserved part of her property, and maintained her interest in its fate. Theoleptos made this quite clear when, from his residence in Philadelphiea, he wrote that she was still interested in the administration of her dowry goods, and held on to the houses and fields she possessed. It appears that at this time she was being dispossessed of some of her property, and Theoleptos tried to persuade her that this was actually beneficial to her soul, for it freed her of worldly cares.¹¹¹ It is certain that Theoleptos was referring to her personal property, and not to the convent's, which was also threatened by outsiders. Nikephoros Choumnos had to appeal several times to the emperor, complaining of the decisions rendered by the courts, before the issue concerning the convent's property could be resolved.¹¹² Undeniable proof of the fact that Irene Choumnaina retained her property — or por-

¹⁰⁹ Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 151, col. 642: «τὰ τῶν κενοδόξων τουτωνὶ γυναιῶν καὶ εὐριπίστων καὶ κούφων, ὁποίας δὴ πλείστας καὶ ἡ Κωνσταντίνου παρ' ἡμῖν τρέφει μετὰ τῆς ὀνομαζομένης εὐγενείας καὶ τὴν κενοφωνίαν καὶ τοὺς μερισμοὺς καὶ τὰ σχίσματα καὶ τὴν τῆς γλώσσης περιποιουμένας ἀκολασίαν καὶ φατρίαν τινὰ περὶ ἑαυτὰς καὶ φήμην καὶ αἰσχρὸν ὄνομα φιλοτιμουμένας κεκτῆσθαι...»

¹¹⁰ Gregoras, III, 238; Typ. IV., p.49; cf. Laurent, “Une princesse”, 47-48.

¹¹¹ Cod. Vatican. Ottobon. Gr. 405, fo. 238ro-239vo.

¹¹² Boissonade, *Anecdota Nova*, 181-190.

tions of it — is provided by a chrysobul of Stephen Dushan, of 1355. This confirmed a donation of a village near Zichna, which Irene gave to the monks of St. John Prodromos. Her generosity was prompted by illness; before that, she had planned to sell them part of the village, and had, indeed, already sold 846 *modioi* before falling ill.¹¹³

It is clear that Irene Choumnaina Palaiologina, pious though she may have been, did not see her life in the convent as constituting a complete break with her previous life. Her involvement in politics, her continuing economic concerns, are in direct contradiction with the ideal of monastic life, as it is presented not only in the typika, but also also in the writings of Theoleptos, among others. This fact suggests that even the relative openness of a Palaiologan nunnery, as we have seen it in the study of the typika, may be understated, and that in reality nuns were quite deeply involved with the world around them.

The foundresses of the convents under discussion endowed them with property which was frequently considerable, without, however reaching the dimensions of the wealth of the great male foundations. Irene Doukaina gave her convent a number of houses which were rented, a bakery, some shops and vineyards; the convent must have had other property as well, which does not appear in the typikon, whose last part is missing.¹¹⁴ The monastery of Christos Philanthropos, as restored by Irene Choumnaina, must have been rich, at least in the beginning, for she endowed it generously from her very extensive property; her dowry, it will be remembered, amazed Pachymeres, and to that she may have added other proper-

¹¹³ Guillou, *St. Jean Prodrome*, 143-144.

¹¹⁴ Typ.I, ch.80; Janin, *Géographie*, 198.

ty of her own. The buildings were sumptuous, and there were 100 nuns.¹¹⁵ Since much of Irene Choumnaina's property was in Macedonia, near Zichna, and in Thrace, it may be assumed that it was lost to the monastery at the time of the Serbian and Ottoman invasions. Theodora Synadene left considerable property to her convent of Good Hope. This consisted mostly of lands and vineyards, which belonged to her in full ownership («ὡς γονιχόν»). In one case, concerning the village Ainos, we see that half of the property had been given to her son by imperial chrysobull, and was then donated by him to the convent. This village had an annual revenue of 400 hyperpyra, which is rather large when one considers that in 1300 Lavra collected, from the village of Selada, 105 hyperpyra per year.¹¹⁶ Theodora added her estate in Pyrgos, and vineyards in Pegai, to be held by the convent in full ownership. Various other pieces of vineyard were donated by herself or her family, or given to buy *adelfata*, or planted at the expense of the convent. All seem to have been situated in Constantinople itself, or in Thrace. Unfortunately, the figures indicating the surface of various parcels of vineyard were left vacant, and therefore it is impossible to estimate the total value of the property. It is interesting to note that Theodora kept a fair amount of property (half of her estate in Pyrgos, a village, a big vineyard, some houses, a garden) for the sustenance of herself and her daughter (who was a nun) during their lifetime — a provision which contradicts the principle of *aktemosyne*.

Other donations were later added to the convent, but they were given for specific purposes, primarily for memorial services. Sometimes, the precise form of a *mnemosynon* was stated, with instructions concerning the quantity of *kolyba*, and the number of candles and priests. At the end of the fourteenth century, one nun as well as the Emperor Manuel II gave money to the convent for restoring those parts of it that were in danger of collapsing;¹¹⁷ by that time, of

¹¹⁵ Gregoras, III, 238; Pachymeres, II, 287.

¹¹⁶ Typ. V, ch.23; cf. Delehaye, "Deux typica", 171-172; cf. *Lavra*, II, 112.

¹¹⁷ Typ. V, pp.102-104.

course, the convent was suffering from the same sort of problems that faced the rest of the landlords blockaded in Constantinople, that is, loss of lands and therefore of revenues. In 1402, the nun Eugenia Philanthropene Kantakouzene, granddaughter of the foundress, left 100 *hyperpyra* to render one piece of vineyard productive, and join it to the "big vineyard."¹¹⁸

The Empress Theodora, together with her mother, left to the convent and hospital of Lips substantial property, situated in Macedonia, in Asia Minor, in the theme of Pergamum, Smyrna, and Anaia; the convent also had gardens, vineyards, houses and shops in Constantinople itself and in the suburbs. The donation was confirmed by Andronikos II.¹¹⁹ The property had belonged to Theodora or her mother by inheritance, purchase, or imperial donation. Some of the lands held by Theodora in a village near Constantinople and in Macedonia had been given her by her son, Andronikos II. The convent was generously endowed, for the typikon gives the annual revenues of some pieces of land, and these were quite high. However, there is no question here of the economic role played by earlier foundations, such as that of Michael Attaleiates. In his *diataxis*, Attaleiates had stated that his heirs, who would be the supervisors of his monastery, would also receive 2/3 of the revenues left over after the expenses of the monastery had been paid. Quite rightly, therefore, P. Lemerle sees this foundation as a way of ensuring that part at least of the founder's property would be protected from sale or alienation, would enjoy a privileged tax position, and would benefit his heirs.¹²⁰ In the case of Lips, as in the case of all the nunneries under discussion, the *epho-roi* are members of the foundress' family, but they do not seem to function as "perpetual *charistikarioi*". Thus, this property in fact was taken out of the foundress' family, and passed into the hands of the church, or rather of the particular convent.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.104-105.

¹¹⁹ Typ. II, ch. 19; cf. Janin, *Géographie*, 318-320.

¹²⁰ Lemerle, *Cinq études*, 309.

The life of Byzantine women was spent either within the family or in the convent. The substitution of convent for family was constantly stressed in the admonitions of Theoleptos of Philadelpheia to the nuns of Christos Philanthropos. But life in the convent did not necessarily mean a negation of family ties: on the contrary, women continued to identify themselves with their secular families in many different ways. Indeed, the foundations of the Comnenian and Palaiologan periods showed a concern for the family which earlier times lacked. Thus, it was the issue of actual or possible family ties that determined the length of the novitiate in the nunnery of the Empress Theodora. A young woman, under 20 years of age, had to remain a novice for three years, and would be allowed to become a nun only at the end of that period. If she were older, but had no experience of life, she had to wait for a year. But if she was old, or had suffered widowhood or loss of children (and thus was a woman who had lived through her reproductive life), then she needed to wait only for six months.¹²¹ A similar concern was shown by Nilos Damilas who wrote that married women, even after they had obtained their husbands' consent to become nuns, had to wait for a year, to determine if they could endure separation from their children. A woman with daughters under ten years of age was not allowed to enter the nunnery unless the girl also entered, to become a nun when she reached the age of consent.¹²² This kind of concern for the family must be contrasted to the values expressed in earlier texts, such as the *Vita* of Saint Theodora of Thessalonica, where the negation of family ties appears as one of the most basic elements of monastic life.¹²³

¹²¹ Typ. II, pp.115-116.

¹²² Typ. VI, 99-100.

¹²³ Arsenij, *Zhitie i podrigi sv. Feodoru Solunskoi* (St. Petersburg, 1899), 12ff.

Although the family was not entirely negated in the Comnenian and Palaiologan convent, there was nevertheless an evident tension between the demands of the monastic life and those of the family. The tension was much less evident in the case of social hierarchies. Those were affirmed in the convent, and the obedience a superior expected and exacted was, perhaps, even higher than that which an upper class woman would receive in the world outside the monastery walls. It was, once again, a very different kind of obedience from the demanding virtue that was exhibited in earlier saints' lives. It seems to have been a social virtue, as well as a religious one.

As for the attitudes of the women who wrote the various documents under discussion, some were general, and some specific to a class. All the women expressed piety, in varying degrees; all were also conversant, in one way or another, with matters pertaining to property. The aristocratic women, whose attitudes are easier to determine, were proud, and valued their family origins and social position; they were adamant about the necessity of work and the evils of idleness.¹²⁴

Some aspects of the life of aristocratic women are also evident from our documents. They were good administrators and good planners; they expected others to work and brooked no disobedience; their separation from men was to some degree self-generated. And their role in society they viewed as intimately connected with their role in the family. The point is, that their families ran the Empire, and so did these women, whether they were in the convent or outside it.

¹²⁴ Typ.V, 71: «ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι, καὶ τοσοῦτον ἀναγκαῖον, ὅσον ἄρα καὶ ἡ καθημερινὴ αὕτη τροφή.»

72: «ἐργάζεσθαι δὲ ἀναγκαῖον, τοῦτο μὲν διὰ τὸν ὑπωπιασμὸν τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τὴν τῆξιν τοῦ σώματος· οὐ γὰρ πρόφασις ἡμῖν ἀργίας ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ματαίου τούτου κόσμου φυγὴ... οὐδ' ἀποφυγὴ πόνου, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ περισσοτέρων κόπων καὶ μόχθων αὕτη ὑπόθεσις, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν εἰς τὸν πλησίον ἀγάπην, ἵν' ἔχωμεν κατὰ γε τὸ παράγγελμα τοῦ ἀποστόλου μεταδιδόναι τῷ χρεῖαν ἔχοντι». Cf. Typ.I, ch. 25.

LATE BYZANTINE NUNS: BY CHOICE OR NECESSITY?

ALICE-MARY TALBOT / CLEVELAND HEIGHTS, OHIO

The nuns of late Byzantium are more poorly documented and, consequently, less well known than their male counterparts. As one indication, one may turn to the index for the first four fascicles of the *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, Ἀαῶν - Ἰωσοῦφης,¹ which lists 787 hieromonks, 870 monks, and 378 abbots. The corresponding figures for female religious are 79 nuns and 5 abbesses, only 4% of the accumulated total of men and women in monastic life published to this point! I very much doubt that in reality monks so greatly outnumbered nuns in late Byzantium, and suggest that the discrepancy is due to under-recording of nuns.² Consider, for example, that at least thirty female convents

¹ *Abkürzungsverzeichnis und Register zum Prosopographischen Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit. 1-4 Faszikel* (Vienna, 1980); hereafter, the *Lexikon* is abbreviated as *PLP*.

² Women in general are slightly better represented in the *PLP*; in fasc. 1, for example, 8% of the names are those of women. In fasc. 3, the percentage of women's names rises to ca. 16%, on account of the number of popular female names in this volume (e.g. Εἰρήνη, Εὐγενία, Εὐδοκία, etc.).

are attested in Constantinople alone during the Paleologan period, and that one of them (the convent of Christ Philanthropos) contained 100 nuns, of whom we know only five by name.³ Clearly countless nuns and abbesses were as faceless and anonymous as in the well-known group portrait from the Lincoln College Typikon.

Perhaps a more accurate picture of the proportion between monks and nuns is reflected by Janin's listings of monasteries in the Byzantine capital;⁴ approximately 55 of the monastic foundations which were active during the Paleologan period were male and 30 were female. Thus there were about half as many convents as male monasteries.⁵

The very low percentage of nuns listed in *PLP* indicates that it is unreliable as a statistical tool, but still invaluable as a compilation of those names that are recorded in surviving texts. My own research has so far gleaned the names of about 200 Paleologan nuns from narrative and epistolary sources, synodal acts, *typika*, saints' lives and the like. The total number will certainly rise as future fascicles of *PLP* appear, but is of course only a small percentage of women who took the veil. Acknowledging that my data is limited, I would still argue that it is sufficient to tell us a great deal about the nuns of late Byzantium, who they were and why they entered convents, and something about the character of female religious life.

³ The figure of 100 nuns is cited by Gregoras, *Hist.*, III, 238. The five nuns are mentioned in unpublished letters to the abbess Eulogia by Theoleptos of Philadelphia and the unidentified second spiritual director; cf. *Ottobon. gr.* 405, fols. 229^v, 233^v, 234^v, 243^r, 243^v, 246^v, 247^r, and V. Laurent, «La direction spirituelle à Byzance: La correspondance d'Irène-Eulogie Choumnaina Paléologine avec son second directeur», *REB*, 14 (1956), 77, 81.

⁴ R. Janin, *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin. I. Le siège de Constantinople et le Patriarcat oecuménique. Tome III. Les églises et les monastères*² (Paris, 1969); hereafter cited as Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique*, III. The numbers are approximate, because in the case of several monasteries it is impossible to determine if they were for men or women.

⁵ Another piece of data is the evidence that when the double monastery of Athanasius was divided in 1383, it held twice as many monks as nuns; cf. Miklosich-Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, II, 81 (hereafter cited as MM).

Byzantine women who wished to renounce the material world, and devote themselves to God, could decide to become nuns at virtually any stage of their lives; one finds great variety in their age and marital status. One clearly defined group of nuns is those who were dedicated to monastic life from infancy or early childhood by their parents. A good example would be Euphrosyne, of the Constantinopolitan convent of the Virgin of Sure Hope, whose mother Theodora «consecrated [her] not only from infancy, but... almost from the moment of her very birth to the all-holy Virgin and Mother of God».⁶ After the widowed Theodora built the convent as a refuge for herself and other women who chose the ascetic way of life, she brought Euphrosyne to live there with her; the child never knew any other way of life. On occasion, orphaned or abandoned children were reared at convents; thus a girl healed by Gregory Palamas had been raised since infancy by a nun at the convent of St. Theodora in Thessalonica.⁷

Very young novices, like Euphrosyne, received some education in the convent, sufficient to read the Scriptures and serve as choir nuns. Apparently some lay children also attended classes in convents, but the practice was discouraged by founders of monasteries, lest it become a distraction for the nuns. Thus Euphrosyne's appendix to her mother's *typikon* prohibited the education of lay girls at the convent, because of their pernicious influence, but did allow the instruction of young girls who intended to become nuns.⁸ In a similar vein, Neilos Damilas, the founder of a provincial convent in

⁶ H. Delehaye, *Deux typica byzantins de l'époque des Paléologues* (Brussels, 1921), 22 (hereafter, Delehaye, *Deux typica*).

⁷ Philotheos, *Encomium of Palamas*, PG 151, 629 B-D.

⁸ Delehaye, *Deux typica*, 97-98.

Crete, permitted the admission of girls younger than ten to «learn their letters» only if they intended to take the veil.⁹ These very youthful postulants had to wait to take final vows until they were of an age to give informed consent; thus the *typikon* of Lips stipulated that girls raised at the convent from infancy or childhood had to wait until their 16th birthday before making a permanent commitment to the monastic habit.¹⁰

A second category is that of young unmarried women who apparently had a true vocation, and chose monastic life of their own volition, although in some cases there may have been family influence or pressure. Such was the case of the saintly Thomais, an orphan girl from Asia Minor, who was adopted by the mother of Nicholas Cabasilas. Following the example of her adoptive mother, she entered the convent of St. Theodora in Thessalonica. We do not know the age at which she took monastic vows, but can assume she was a fairly young woman, since her monastic career began prior to 1387 and lasted until her death in 1429, a period of at least 42 years. In 1387, after the conquest of Thessalonica by the Turks, Thomais went to Lemnos where she met George Sphrantzes' grandfather and his family. Thomais in turn influenced the eldest daughter to take the veil, even though she was betrothed, and together they traveled to Constantinople where they entered the convent of Klerena.¹¹

The influence of other family members is also seen in the case of the Palamas family, for after Gregory decided to become a monk

⁹ S. Petrides. «Le typikon de Nil Damilas pour le monastère de femmes de Baeonia en Crète (1400)», *IRAIK* 15 (1911), 100 (hereafter cited as «Le typikon de Nil Damilas»). In the same passage Damilas forbade the admission to the convent of any runaway female slave, who sought to be tonsured without the permission of her master.

¹⁰ Delehayé, *Deux typica*, 116.

¹¹ On Thomais, see G. Sphrantzes, *Chronicon*, ed. Grecu, 2, 32-36, and *PLP*, n^o. 7760.

ca. 1316 at the age of 20, his two sisters and mother followed suit, becoming nuns at a convent in the capital.¹²

More curious, to our present way of thinking, was the renunciation of the world by *married* women. It was not at all uncommon in Byzantium for a husband and wife to give up their conjugal life once their children were grown, and for both to take monastic vows either at totally separate monasteries, or at a double monastery.¹³ Nicephorus Choumnos and his wife, who joined their daughter, Eirene-Eulogia, at the monastery of Christ Philanthropos, are a well-known example of this practice.¹⁴

¹² On Gregory's decision to become a monk, see J. Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris, 1959), 50, 58 and 74, n. 30; on his sisters and mother, see Philotheos, *Encomium of Palamas*, PG 151, 558, 562, 572 ff., 593 f. Gregory's mother was named Kallone and took the monastic name Kale; her daughters were Epicharis and Theodote.

¹³ Thus in the *typikon* for the convent of Lips, the foundress Theodora foresaw the possibility that one of her daughters might choose monastic life «in agreement with her husband»; Delehay, *Deux typica*, 129.

¹⁴ See J. Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos, homme d'état et humaniste byzantin. 1255-1327* (Paris, 1959), 62; Verpeaux, «Notes prosopographiques sur la famille Choumnos», *Byzantinoslavica*, XX (1959), 256-7; V. Laurent, «Une princesse byzantine au cloître», *EO*, XXIX (1930), 46-7; Laurent, «Une fondation monastique de Nicéphore Choumnos. 'Η ἐν ΚΠ. μονὴ τῆς Θεοτόκου τῆς Γοργοεπηκόου», *REB*, XII (1954), 43; I. Ševčenko, *Etudes sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos* (Brussels, 1962), 9 and n. 1, 127-8 and n. 2, 144 and n. 3.

In an unpublished letter to their daughter, the abbess Eulogia, Theoleptos encouraged her parents to separate and enter monastic life (*Ottobon. gr.* 405, fol. 247'): τῷ πατρί σου καὶ τῇ μητρὶ σου ὁ Θεὸς συγχωρήσοι. καὶ τὰ μὲν τέκνα αὐτῶν εὐχομαι διαναστῆναι πρὸς εὐποιάν καὶ εὐαρέστησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ· τοὺς δὲ γεννητορας αὐτῶν ἀξιῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν διαστῆναι ἀπ' ἀλλήλων καὶ προσμεῖναι ἐν τοῖς μοναστηρίοις, καὶ μοναδικῶς διατελέσαι τὰς ὑπολείπους ἡμέρας αὐτῶν, ἵνα δι' ὀλίγων ἡμερῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ ἑπταδίκῳ τούτῳ βίῳ μερίδα δεδωκότες καὶ τοῖς ὀκτώ. ἀνάπαυσιν εὐρήσουσιν ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι τὴν μηδέποτε παυομένην, ἥνικα καταλείψωσι τὰ παρόντα.

The mutual decision of a married couple to enter monastic life is described in some detail in a patriarchal act of ca. 1400.¹⁵ Ignatios Theologites and his wife Makrina, «as the result of a common decision and desire... chose to adopt the monastic habit, in the belief that life in this world was a useless tumult and veritable hell. Once their decision was firm, it did not seem expedient and profitable to them to delay and postpone, but they thought it necessary to carry out their purpose. Therefore since the monk was short of ready cash, first he confirmed the nun in her dowry, then in the desire to help her, he strove to find a small convent in which she could reside and spend the rest of her life in a God-loving and holy manner, and in the same way a small cell (or *kathisma*) for himself suitable for the solitary life.»

To condense somewhat the account of the synodal act, Ignatios found a ruined convent dedicated to St. Panteleimon, and restored it at considerable expense as a dwelling-place for nuns, while he settled in a *kathisma* belonging to the monastery of St. Sampson to which he donated the rest of his property. Later Ignatios was joined by two friends with whom he constructed a new *kathisma*, dedicated to the Virgin, and adjacent to his wife's monastic abode. Although the sources do not specifically describe the two establishments as a double monastery, they do seem to have been united in some way. After the passage of several years, the monk Ignatios fell into acute financial distress, and his wife, who controlled all the remaining funds, refused to give him any monetary assistance. The elderly monk lodged a complaint against his wife and they were both summoned before the patriarch, who was unable to ascertain the truth of the monk's accusation, and therefore ordered that the two monasteries were to be separated, and the properties divided equally between Makrina and Ignatios. In a situation like this that ended in a law court, one wonders about the relations between the couple before they separated and took monastic vows!

¹⁵ MM II, 407-410, 468-469; J. Darrouzès, *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople. Vol. I. Les actes des patriarches. Fasc. VI. Les registres de 1377 à 1410* (Paris, 1979), nos. 3144, 3190 (hereafter, Darrouzès, *Regestes*, VI).

At least two cases are documented in which a woman took the veil for the specific purpose of escaping an unhappy marriage. We are told, for example, of the wife of Kyprianos, from Thessalonica, who entered a convent because of her husband's difficult character.¹⁶ Another woman from Thessalonica, Hypomone Kalothetina, became a nun after her husband falsely accused her of adultery and murdered her mother!¹⁷

Unlike Makrina, whose husband supported her decision to enter monastic life, some married women sought to become nuns without their husband's permission. Thus Neilos Damilas cautioned in his *typikon* against admitting a married woman to the convent against the will of her husband.¹⁸ George Sphrantzes worried that if he continued his lengthy absences from home while undertaking diplomatic missions for the emperor, his wife might leave him for a nunnery. In 1451 he had just returned from a 23-month trip to Georgia, when Constantine XI asked him to leave on another extended embassy. Replied Sphrantzes, «I am afraid that my wife will be angry and go away to become a nun, or else will leave me and take another husband.»¹⁹

Another incentive for taking the veil, gratitude for miraculous healing, is illustrated by the story of Katenitzina, a woman from Brusa who had been possessed by demons for 13 years. After escaping from Brusa at the time of its capture by the Ottomans in 1326, she made her way to Constantinople where she sought healing at the numerous shrines of the city. When she was finally cured by the relics of the patriarch Athanasius, she decided to become a

¹⁶ G. Sphrantzes, *Chronikon*, ed. Grecu, 32 (XVIII, 3): ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τοῦ Κυπριανοῦ γυνὴν, ἣτις ἀγανακτήσασα τὸ σκληρὸν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἀπελθοῦσα εἰς τὰς ἡθελίας μοναχὰς καλογραία γέγονεν.

¹⁷ MM II, 238-240; Darrouzès, *Regestes*, VI, no. 2988.

¹⁸ Petrides, «Le typikon de Nil Damilas», 100.

¹⁹ G. Sphrantzes, *Chronikon*, ed. Grecu, 86 (XXXIII, 3).

nun in the female part of the double monastery founded by the patriarch, and took the monastic name Athanasia to symbolize her debt to her saintly benefactor. Katenitzina's husband, who was enabled to escape from Turkish captivity through the miraculous intervention of St. Athanasius, followed his wife to the capital, and, like her, was tonsured at the monastery of Athanasius.²⁰

The tales of Katenitzina and her husband, and of Thomais, the orphan girl from Anatolia, also reflect another factor which motivated men and women of the Paleologan period to enter monasteries, the disruption caused by the Turkish conquests. For refugees uprooted from their homes, who fled to the capital or safer provinces, monastic life truly offered a harbor from the tumult of life, and security and companionship for those who had lost family and possessions. Particularly poignant is the case of Eudokia, the mother of St. Philotheos the Athonite, who was originally from Elateia in Asia Minor, and out of fear of the Turks emigrated with her husband to Chrysopolis on the Strymon River sometime in the third quarter of the 14th c. After the death of her husband, the family was left in dire straits, since they had no friends or relatives to assist them. To add to Eudokia's woes, her two sons were taken by the Turks for the child-levy or *devshirme*, and she was left alone. To quote from the *Vita Philothei*, «Their mother, who was deprived of everything, and had no relative or any other consolation... wept and lamented the loss of her dear children, ... and had no one to help her... she was in a strange and alien land and had no parents or husband...» Therefore she gave all her possessions to the poor, and entered a double monastery, where she was reunited with her sons, who had escaped Turkish captivity and found refuge from the *devshirme* in monastic life.²¹

²⁰ A.-M. Talbot. *Faith Healing in Late Byzantium: The Posthumous Miracles of the Patriarch Athanasios I of Constantinople by Theoktistos the Stoudite* (Brookline, MA, 1983), 114-120.

²¹ B. Papoulia, «Die Vita des hl. Philotheos vom Athos», *Südostforschungen* 22 (1963), 274-76.

A similar pattern was followed by Anastasia and her daughter, Agathonike, who fled to Thracian Herakleia in the early 14th century after a Turkish attack on their home in the Troad. Anastasia's brother, the monk Theodosios, built a small convent there to provide a refuge for his sister and niece.²²

More difficult to interpret is the case of the nun who was «removed from the impious Turks» in the early 14th century by the abbess Eirene-Eulogia Choumnaina, and installed in the convent of Christ Philanthropos. It is unclear whether Eulogia ransomed the woman from captivity or persuaded her to return to her Christian faith after conversion to Islam.²³

Better known is the case of Helene, the wife of the historian George Sphrantzes, whose life had more than its share of tragedies. The mother of five children, three of whom died in infancy or early childhood, she was captured by the Turks at the fall of Constantinople in 1453, and sold to the sultan's Master of the Horse, together with her two surviving teenage children. Helene was eventually ransomed by her husband, but their two children were sold into the Sultan's entourage. The young John, accused of an assassination plot, was killed by Mehmed, while his sister Thamar died soon after in the seraglio from an infectious disease. No wonder that George and Helene finally sought the solace of monasteries on Corfu, and took monastic vows on the same date, August 1, 1468. He was 67, and would live nine more years; his wife must have been about 45.²⁴

In the middle period of Byzantine history, there were numerous instances of women, usually members of the imperial family, who were forced to enter convents against their wills; I need mention

²² MM I, 157 ff.; PG 152, 1206-1207.

²³ The text is found in a letter of Theoleptos of Philadelphia to the abbess Eulogia, *Ottobon. gr.* 405, fol. 228^v: τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἦν ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσεβῶν, καὶ ἀπὸ σοῦ μακρὰν ἀναστρεφομένην ἀνεζήτησαν καὶ εἰσήγαγες πρὸς ἑαυτήν, μετὰ κυβερνήσεως ῥύθμιζε (ῥίθμιζε cod.) μήπως ὑπὸ τῆς σκληρότητος δράσῃ τι τῶν οὐ προσηκόντων. Cf. also V. Laurent, «Une princesse byzantine au cloître», 55. I am indebted to Dr. Angela Hero, who drew my attention to this passage, and generously provided me with photographs of the manuscript.

²⁴ G. Sphrantzes, *Chronikon*, ed. Grecu, 98, 104, 106, 136 (XXXV, 11-12; XXXVII, 3, 6, 9; XLV, 3).

only the empress Theodora and her daughters who were shut up in a nunnery in 856 after the *coup d'état* of Michael III and Bardas; the five sisters of Romanus II who were forcibly placed in convents in 959 at the instigation of Theophano; and Theodora and Zoe, the daughters of Constantine VIII, who were temporarily exiled to convents by the emperors Romanus III and Michael V respectively.²⁵ In late Byzantium, on the other hand, I have found only one case of an empress who retired to a convent under political pressure; this was Eirene, the wife of John VI Kantakouzenos, who entered the convent of Kyra Martha in 1354 when her husband abdicated the throne and became a monk at the monastery of St. George of the Mangana.²⁶

There were occasions, however, when women were forced into monastic vows against their will. Thus Amarantina, a notorious soothsayer and sorceress in the capital, was compelled by the patriarch and synod to enter the convent of Pertze as a form of repentance for her sins, to make amends for her former way of life.²⁷ In a different category, the wives of priests who were elevated to a bishopric had to leave their husbands and adopt the monastic habit.²⁸ We also know of a case in which a young woman's fiancé

²⁵ *Theodora and her daughters*: Theoph. Cont., *Hist.*, IV, 22 (PG 109, 188D-189A); Zonaras, *Hist.*, XVI, 3 (PG 135, 20A); *five sisters of Romanus II*: Theoph. Cont., *Hist.*, VI, 3 (PG 109, 489 B-C); Cedrenus, *Hist.* (PG 122, 77C-D); *Theodora and Zoe*: Psellus, *Chronographia*, ed. Renauld, I (Paris 1926), 98-100, 105-7.

²⁶ Kantakouzenos, *Hist.*, IV, 41 (Bonn ed., III, 304-308); Gregoras, *Hist.*, XXIX, 30 (Bonn ed., III, 243-244).

²⁷ MM I, 301-306, 317-318, 342-344, 549-550; Darrouzès, *Regestes*, V, nos. 2316, 2318, 2331, 2334, 2575.

²⁸ Cf. unpublished letter of patriarch Athanasius I of Constantinople, *Vat. gr.* 2219, fol. 209^v: οἱ δ' αὖ καὶ ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἀρίστοις ἐν γυναικείαις μοναῖς τὰς τοῦ βίου συζύγους ἐκείνων, ἀξιώσομεν κυβερνήσεως ἐκείνων μακρὰν ποιουμένων κανονικῶς τὰς διατριβὰς εἰς δόξαν Χριστοῦ καὶ τιμὴν καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίας οἰκοδομήν. See also V. Laurent, *Regestes*, IV, no. 1764.

decided to become a priest, and she subsequently became a nun.²⁹

No doubt there were instances when a wife was pressured to take monastic vows together with her husband, or vice-versa, and entered monastic life unwillingly. A documented case of «the reluctant wife» is that of Pepagomene, who adopted the monastic habit at the end of the 14th century together with her husband Gerontios Proximos, «by mutual consent» (ἐκ συμφώνου). After a few months of monastic life, however, she underwent a change of heart, left her convent and sought to recover her dowry. Pepagomene claimed that her husband had deceived her into thinking that their stay in a monastery was only temporary, a refuge from the uncertain political climate perhaps, and that they would resume married life as soon as John VII Paleologus, the nephew of Manuel II, returned to Constantinople. But after John came back to the capital in 1399 and was reconciled with his uncle, Gerontios remained in his monastery and made no effort to rejoin his wife, who was eventually persuaded by the patriarch to return to her convent.³⁰

Frequently it was the crisis of widowhood that led Byzantine women to the refuge of convents. Kallone Palamas was so distraught over the death of her husband that she wanted to take the veil immediately, notwithstanding the fact that she had five children under the age of seven to care for. She was dissuaded from this course, and waited until her children became teenagers. Once her eldest son, Gregory, decided to become a monk on Athos, Kallone and all the children joined him in taking monastic vows.³¹

²⁹ The daughter of the priest George Boutzas; cf. MM II, 48-50 and Darrouzès, *Regestes*, VI, no. 2749.

³⁰ MM II, 458-460; Darrouzès, *Regestes*, VI, no. 3183.

³¹ Philotheos, *Encomium of Palamas*, PG 151, 558, 562.

For widows monastic life offered companionship and financial security, as is spelled out by the late thirteenth century agreement between Zoe Syropoulina and the convent of Nea Petra in Thessaly.³² Like Eudokia, the mother of St. Philotheos, whom we have already discussed, Zoe had not only lost her husband, but had no brothers or sisters or children to look after her. In 1271 she found herself in a desperate situation, without a place to lay her head or sufficient food to eat. In her distress she turned to Anna Maliasena, the foundress of the patriarchal convent of Nea Petra. Zoe promised to donate to the convent her ancestral property, including three vineyards and four fields, on condition that she be admitted as a nun without any payment of dowry, receive the tonsure and be supported for the rest of her life. It was further understood that at the time of her death Zoe was to receive proper burial and be commemorated at the convent with requiem masses.

It was not just poor widows, however, who sought refuge in convents, but also women of wealthy family who for various reasons chose to renounce the world after the death of their husbands. The best known example in late Byzantium is that of Eirene Choumnaina, who at the age of twelve became the daughter-in-law of the emperor Andronicus II through her marriage to the Despot John Paleologus, but was tragically widowed four years later. Perhaps motivated by the feeling that once she had been married to a prince, any other marriage would be a comedown, partly influenced by the pious example of her elder sister, who was already a nun, Eirene founded the double monastery of Christ Philanthropos and embarked on a lengthy monastic career.³³

³² MM IV, 393-396.

³³ Gregoras, *Hist.*, III, 238-240; Laurent, «Une princesse byzantine au cloître», 29-60.

Princesses of the Paleologan or Cantacuzene families who had been sent off as brides to distant rulers, serving as instruments of Byzantine diplomacy, frequently returned to convents in Constantinople after their husbands died. These women, uprooted from familiar surroundings at a tender age, usually felt no desire to remain in a foreign land, but also had no home to return to in the capital. Thus, Simonis Paleologina, daughter of Andronicus II, sent to Stephen Milutin of Serbia as a child bride at the age of five, came back to Constantinople as a 27-year old widow and spent the rest of her life at the convent of St. Andrew in Kriasi.³⁴ Maria Cantacuzene, daughter of the emperor John VI, who journeyed to Epirus to become the wife of the Despot Nicephorus II, also returned to the capital after the death of her husband to join her mother Eirene at the convent of Kyra Martha.³⁵

Convents provided sanctuary not only for poor and lonely widows, and the elderly, but also for the mentally ill, as we learn from a very interesting synodal act concerning Tzourakina, who was made the ward of the monastery of St. Andrew in Kriasi in 1402. When Tzourakina was possessed by an evil spirit, and was no longer men-

³⁴ Gregoras, *Hist.*, I, 318; M. Laskaris, *Vizantiske princeze u srednjevekonj Srbij* (Belgrade, 1926), 81; reviewed by F. Dölger, *BZ* 27 (1927), 132; A. Th. Papadopoulos, *Versuch einer Genealogie der Palaiologen* (Amsterdam, 1962), no. 65, pp. 41-42.

³⁵ Kantakouzenos, *Hist.*, IV, 33 (Bonn ed. III, 319): βασίλισσα δὲ ἡ ἐκείνου γαμετὴ ἔτι ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ διατρίβουσα, ἐπεὶ πύθοιτο τὴν ἐκείνου τελευτὴν, ἐπένθησε μὲν ἐκεῖ ἐφ' ἱκανόν, καὶ ἀπωδύρατο τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὴν τελευτὴν· ἔπειτα εἰς Βυζάντιον ἔλθοῦσα, συνῆν τὸν ἐπίλοιπον βίον βασιλίδι τῇ μητρὶ κατὰ τὴν Μάρθας μονὴν διατριβούσῃ.

tally competent, there was concern that she might fall victim to unscrupulous persons and be tricked out of her property, consisting of a house and church. Therefore the patriarch arranged for her house to be auctioned off at a fair price, and for the proceeds from the sale of her property to be granted to the convent to pay for her care by the nuns.³⁶

My final category of Byzantine nuns is those who took monastic vows on their deathbed, for whom the convent was only a temporary resting place. It was common in Byzantium for men and women to adopt the monastic habit when they were terminally ill, in the belief that this last minute dedication of their lives to Christ would help them to attain salvation in the life hereafter. The way in which monasteries benefited financially from this practice is graphically illustrated by a description of the final days of Eirene Apokauchissa, found in the synodal register. Eirene was apparently a widow and her son was abroad; therefore she had originally made a will in favor of her cousin's husband, Demetrios Boulotes. When she fell seriously ill, however, she changed her mind and decided to become a nun at the convent of St. Cyprian, to which she planned to bequeath all her property. According to a synodal act of 1401, the abbess at first tried to dissuade her from this plan. Subsequently, however, when Demetrios Boulotes and his wife rejected their cousin, refused to bury her, and said Eirene could leave her property to anyone she wished, the abbess agreed to admit the dying woman to the convent. There she was tonsured, received extreme unction, died in peace and was buried by the nuns, who were declared the legal heirs of all her worldly goods.³⁷

³⁶ H. Hunger, «Zu den restlichen Inedita des Konstantinopler Patriarchatsregisters im cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 48», *REB* 24 (1966), 66-68; Darrouzès, *Regestes*, VI, 3257.

³⁷ *MM* II, 509-510; Darrouzès, *Regestes*, VI, 3216; *PLP* 1193.

In conclusion a *caveat*: despite the emphasis of this paper on the external influences, orphanhood, unhappy marriage, poverty, widowhood, disease and old age, which led Byzantine girls and women to enter convents, I do not wish to leave the reader with the impression that materialistic considerations were the overriding factor in their monastic vocations. The final centuries of Byzantium, when the declining empire was beset by constant external and internal dangers, were an era in which the pious Byzantines had even greater need of their faith. Most of them were inclined toward the monastic life by ascetic zeal and a desire for true repentance; they sincerely hoped to find internal peace and salvation by ending their days in a monastery.³⁸ The factors I have enumerated only helped them to make the spiritual decision about the stage at which they would make a commitment to the monastic habit.

³⁸ One might note the frequent allusions in *typika* and synodal acts to the monastery as a haven or safe harbor from the tempests of life; cf., for example, the *typikon* of the Convent of the Virgin of Sure Hope (Delehaye, *Deux typica*, p. 22), where the convent is described as an «ἀσφαλὲς... καταγώγιον» and «λιμένος... εὐαγγάλου τινός». See also the *typikon* for the convent of Lips, cp. 40 (Delehaye, *Deux typica*, 128-9): ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν ἐφετῶν παντὶ δήπου τυγχάνει τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἢ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν κοσμικῶν πραγμάτων ἀποταγή, ἀρραβὼν τις οὔσα τῆς μελλούσης ἀπαθείας καὶ τῆς δι' αὐτῆς καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀπολαύσεως, καὶ πάντες τε καὶ πᾶσαι δι' εὐχῆς αὐτοῦ τυχεῖν τίθενται καὶ ὥς ἐκ ζάλης τοῦ βίου πρὸς λιμένα φθάσαι σωτήριον κατεπεύγονται...

IRENE-EULOGIA CHOUMNAINA PALAIOLOGINA
 ABBESS OF THE CONVENT OF PHILANTHROPOS
 SOTER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

ANGELA C. HERO / NEW YORK, N.Y.

Irene-Eulogia Choumnaina Palaiologina, whom her admirers acclaimed as the most wise and learned woman of her time while her detractors denounced as another Jezebel,¹ is the most celebrated abbess of the Palaiologan period. She is known from narrative and epistolary sources, from the invectives of the protagonists in the Hesychast controversy and from her own correspondence with her spiritual director. The melancholy story of her life has been told

¹ See Matthew of Ephesos, Τῇ Παλαιολογίνῃ, ed. D. Reinsch, *Die Briefe des Matthaios von Ephesos im Codex Vindobonensis Theol. Gr. 174* (Berlin, 1974), no. 32, 136, lines 5-7: Ὁ δὴ καὶ σύ, γυναικῶν ἀρίστη, νοῦ μεγέθει φρονοῦσα, καίτοι φύσει τε καὶ παιδείᾳ κοσμηθεῖσα ὡς μηδενός, οὐ τις ἂν εἴποι, καλοῦ λείπεσθαι... Eulogia's spiritual director also wrote that in learning she surpassed by far all contemporary women; cf. *Scorialensis Gr. Φ-III-11* (hereafter, *Scorialensis*), fol. 240v (Letter 10 in the forthcoming edition): ...τῇ γυναικῶν ἀπασῶν, ὅσαι νῦν εἰσι, β α σ ι λ ι κ ῶ τ ῶ π ῆ χ ε ι [Herod., I, 178] εὐπαιδείᾳ κρατούση. For similar compliments by Akindynos and Gregoras, see notes 68 and 69 *infra*. For the insults directed against her by the Palamites, see notes 65-67 *infra*.

with characteristic eloquence by the late Fr. Laurent in two long and masterly articles.²

In the twenty-five years which have elapsed since the appearance of Laurent's second article, the rise of interest in Hesychasm has spurred the publication of many sources pertinent to that controversy, and these writings together with the forthcoming edition of Choumnaina's own correspondence cast a new light on the character study of the abbess of the convent of Philanthropos Soter.³

Born in 1291,⁴ Irene was the second of the two daughters of Nikephoros Choumnos, the wealthy and scholarly chancellor of Andronikos II. Unlike her elder sister who entered the cloister early in life and was never heard from again,⁵ Irene was first chosen by Andronikos to be the bride of his nephew, the emperor of Trebizond,⁶ and when this match failed to materialize, she was

² Cf. «Une princesse byzantine au cloître. Irène Eulogie Choumnos Paléologine, fondatrice du couvent de femmes του Φιλανθρώπου Σωτήρος,» *EO*, 29 (1930), 29-60 and «La direction spirituelle à Byzance. La correspondance d'Irène-Eulogie Choumnaina Paléologine avec son second directeur,» *REB*, 14 (1956), 49-86. For the bare facts of Eulogia's life, see the biographical sketch by J. Verpeaux, «Notes prosopographiques sur la famille Choumnos,» *Byzantinoslavica*, 20 (1959), no. 17, 260-61.

³ My edition of these letters, accompanied by English translation and commentary and an introduction by Fr. John Meyendorff, is now completed and will be published by the Hellenic College Press, Brookline, Mass.

⁴ The date of Eulogia's birth is deduced from Choumnos' statement that his daughter was widowed at the age of sixteen; see Πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα βασιλίσσαν, ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τῆς χηρείας, αὐτῆς ἑξακαίδεκατον ἀγούσης χρόνον, ed. J.F. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca* (Paris, 1829-33; reprint, Hildesheim, 1962), I, 293. For the date of her husband's death, see note 9 *infra*.

⁵ Eulogia's elder sister is known only from Choumnos' testament; cf. Διαθήκη, ed. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, IV, 335; Verpeaux, «Notes prosopographiques,» no. 15, 257.

⁶ See Pachymeres, *De Andronico Palaeologo*, IV, 7: II, 287-89; Laurent, «Une princesse byzantine au cloître,» 39-40.

married at the age of twelve to the young Despot John, eldest son of Andronikos II and Yolanda-Irene of Montferrat.⁷ This reportedly happy union lasted hardly four years.⁸ The young prince died suddenly in 1307 and his despondent widow, despite the strong objections of her parents, decided without delay to withdraw from the world.⁹ At the advice of the Metropolitan Theoleptos of Phila-

⁷ According to Pachymeres, John was married shortly after his grandmother's death which occurred during the second week of Lent; cf. *De Andronico Palaeologo*, V, 4-5: II, 377-79. Since the Augusta Theodora died on 4 March 1303, the young couple must have been married shortly after Easter of that year. For the correct date of Theodora's death, see I. Ševčenko, «Le sens et la date du traité 'Anepigraphos' de Nicéphore Choumnos,» *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques, Académie Royale de Belgique*, 5th ser., 35 (1949). 485-86.

⁸ Theodore Hyrtakenos described Choumnaina's marriage as truly made in heaven; cf. Μονωδία ἐπὶ τῷ περιποθήτῳ... κυρῷ Νικηφόρῳ Χούμνῳ τῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ κανικλείου, ed. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, I, 286, lines 6-8. For the duration of the marriage, see Gregoras, *Hist.*, VII, 5: I, 241.

⁹ Since John was married in the spring of 1303 and his marriage lasted less than four full years, his death must be dated to the early months of 1307, as A-M. Talbot notes, correcting Verpeaux's statement that the Despot John died at the end of 1307; see *The Correspondence of Athanasius I Patriarch of Constantinople. Letters to the Emperor Andronicus II, Members of the Imperial Family, and Officials* (Dumbarton Oaks Texts III = CFHB, VII, Washington, D.C., 1975). note to Letter 96, 3-4; Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos, homme d'état et humaniste byzantin* (ca. 1250/1255-1327) (Paris, 1959), 48; *idem*, «Notes prosopographiques,» 260 note 57. Irene must have been tonsured very soon after her husband's death. Theodore Hyrtakenos says in his eulogy of Choumnos that she was married to the Lord immediately (εὐθὺς) after her bereavement; cf. *op. cit.* (as in note 8 *supra*), 287, lines 2-5. For Choumnos' objections to his daughter's decision and his quarrel with Theoleptos for encouraging her to dispense with worldly possessions, see his Ἀνεπίγραφος, ed. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, V. 297-313, and Ševčenko's ingenious deciphering of this obscure document, *op. cit.* (as in note 7 *supra*), 473-78.

delphia,¹⁰ she spent part of her fortune for the relief of the poor and the ransoming of prisoners of war and with the remainder she rebuilt the convent of Philanthropos Soter in Constantinople which she entered taking the name of Eulogia.¹¹ Theoleptos tonsured her with his own hands and remained her spiritual director for nearly fourteen years,¹² directing her by correspondence whenever his duties at his distant metropolis kept him away from the capital. While none of her letters to Theoleptos survive, five of his letters to Eulogia have been preserved. The first, which is the only one pu-

¹⁰ On Theoleptos of Philadelphia, see now the biographical sketch and bibliography in *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, fasc. 4 (Vienna, 1980), no. 7509. Note, however, that Theoleptos, who died nearly two decades before the beginning of the Hesychast controversy in 1341, was not a correspondent of Akindynos, as the *Lexikon* states, following J. Gouillard, *DTC*, 15¹, col. 340. The metropolitan of Philadelphia to whom Akindynos addressed one letter in 1345 was Makarios Chrysokephalos; see G. I. Passarelli, *Macario Crisocefalo (1300-1382)*, *OCA*, 210 (Rome, 1980), 32.

¹¹ See Gregoras, *Hist.*, XXIX, 22: III, 238, lines 17-20; Ph. Meyer, «Bruchstücke zweier κτητορικά τυπικά,» *BZ*, 4 (1895), 48. On the convent of Philanthropos Soter, see R. Janin, «Les monastères du Christ Philanthrope à Constantinople,» *REB*, 4 (1946), 151-62; and *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin. I. Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique. 3. Les églises et les monastères*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1969), 541-42. Adjacent to, but separate from the nunnery, was the male monastery. It bore the same name and was under the patronage of Eulogia, but not under her spiritual jurisdiction; cf. Laurent, «Une princesse byzantine au cloître,» 46-49; S. Salaville, «Une lettre et un discours inédits de Théolepte de Philadelphie,» *REB*, 5 (1947), 108-109.

¹² See the superscription of Theoleptos' first letter to Choumnaina, ed. Salaville, *op. cit.* (as in note 11 *supra*), 105. The same superscription accompanies his second letter in the cod. *Ottobonianus Gr.* 405, fol. 218r: 'Επιστολή Θεολήπτου Φιλαδελφείας πρὸς βασίλισσαν Εἰρήνην, τὴν διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθεῖσαν Εὐλογίαν μοναχὴν καὶ γνησίαν πνευματικὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ χρηματίσασαν, ἣν καὶ οἰκείαις χερσὶν ἀπεκείρατο. Eulogia was separated from her spiritual father shortly after her tonsure. As S.I. Kourouses has shown, Theoleptos was already in Philadelphia by 1309 when he sent his protonotary, Manuel Gabalas, to Constantinople on a mission concerning the defense of Philadelphia against the Turks; cf. Μανουὴλ Γαβαλάς εἰς Ματθαῖος μητροπολίτης

blished,¹³ dates from the very beginning of their association when she was preparing to take her vows, whereas the other four were written during the last year of his life and are full of interest for the study of spiritual direction, of life in the cloister and of the abbess' character and psychology.¹⁴

From these letters we learn that Eulogia reported to her adviser on the minutiae of convent life — the difficult task of managing some of her subordinates, the quarrels among them, the progress of some of the nuns and the illnesses of others. She also told him of her distress over property disputes with her family and confessed to him her inner turmoil and her desire to be near him. As she wrote years later to her other adviser, Eulogia found directing by correspondence an unsatisfactory procedure. «The word of mouth,» she

Ἐφέσου (1271/2-1355/60) (Athens, 1972), 68. During the following year Theoleptos refused to recognize the reconciliation of the Church with the Arsenites and he remained in schism during the patriarchates of Niphon (1310-14) and of John Glykys (1314-19); cf. the excerpt from the appeal to Kantakouzenos by Arsenios of Tyre published by Kourouses, *op. cit.*, 137-38; and Laurent, «Les crises religieuses à Byzance. Le schisme antiarsenite du métropolitain de Philadelphie Théolepte († c. 1324),» *REB*, 18 (1960), 45-54. He was back in Constantinople during the period between September 1317 and October 1318 when he attended the sessions of the Permanent Synod (Miklosich-Müller, I, 75-83; 92-93). His last attested visit to the capital was in June 1321 when at the behest of Andronikos II he acted as an intermediary between the senior emperor and his rebellious grandson; cf. Gregoras, *Hist.*, VIII, 6: 1, 320-321; Kantakouzenos, *Hist.*, 1, 14, 19: 1, 67; 94-96. By November of the same year, the metropolitan was back at his diocese where he died in the last months of 1322; cf. Kourouses, *op. cit.*, 335-39.

¹³ See ed. Salaville, «Une lettre...» (as in note 11 *supra*), 105-106.

¹⁴ I studied these letters in the oldest surviving MS, *Ottob.* 405, fols. 218r-247r: See Kourouses' careful analysis of these letters. *op. cit.* (as in note 12 *supra*), 335-39. On the basis of internal evidence, Kourouses argues convincingly that the four letters, which are consecutive, were written between December 1321 and November 1322. The first letter dates from the Christmas holidays, following the metropolitan's return from the capital in the fall of 1321, while the fourth was written from Theoleptos' deathbed.

said, «differs from the inanimate word as much as the living and speaking man differs from his inanimate image in a painting.»¹⁵ When Theoleptos returned to the besieged city of Philadelphia for the last time in the autumn of 1321 and because of the hazardous traveling conditions he could not find a suitable person to entrust his letters to his spiritual daughter, Eulogia fell prey to «suspicion and anxiety» and even thought of leaving the convent and retiring somewhere near her director.¹⁶ She had expressed this desire before,¹⁷ but this time a quarrel with one of the nuns — a fallen woman by the name of Agathonike in whom she had taken a keen personal interest —¹⁸ made her doubt her own vocation as an abbess and figured largely in her plan to give up her duties and leave the capital.

¹⁵ See *Scorialensis*, fol. 239v. (Letter 9): περί δὲ τὸ γράφειν, τοσοῦτο διαφέρει ἡ ζῶσα φωνὴ τῆς ἀψύχου, ὅσον ὁ ζῶν ἄνθρωπος καὶ λαλῶν τῆς ἐν πίνακι εἰκόνης αὐτοῦ.

¹⁶ Letter 1, *Ottob.* 405, fols. 230r-230v: 'Ὡς ἔμαθον, διότι οὐπω διεκομίσθησαν παρ' ἡμῶν γράμματα, ὑπονοίας ἐδέξω καὶ συνέχεαν τὸν λογισμόν σου. ἴσθι δὲ ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ λήθης ἢ ῥαθυμίας ἀπήντησε τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ μὴ εὐρίσκεισθαι τὸν ἐπιτήδειον εἰς τὴν τοιαύτην διακονίαν· εἰ γάρ καὶ πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὧδε εἰς τὴν ἰκωνοσταντίνου πορεύονται, ἀλλ' ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν οἱ τοῦ πιστεύεσθαι ἄξιοι παρακαταθήκην πνευματικὴν. *Ibid.*, fol. 233r: 'Ὡς ἔμαθον ὅτι ὀχλεῖ καὶ σε λογισμὸς ἀπολιπεῖν τὸ κελλίον καὶ τὸ σεμνεῖον καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ ἀπελθεῖν ἢ τὰ ὧδε καταλαβεῖν, καὶ λέγω σοι μὴ μόνον τὴν πρὸς τοῦτο ὀρμὴν ἐκκόψαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν λογισμόν περιελεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς σῆς ψυχῆς ὥς ἀπρεπὴ καὶ ἀσυντελεῖ.

¹⁷ See *ibid.*, fol. 233r: τὸν τοιοῦτον λογισμόν οἶδας ὅτι καὶ παρὼν αὐτόθι ἀνέκοπτον· τὸ αὐτὸ ποιῶ καὶ διὰ τῆς παρούσης ἐπιστολῆς.

¹⁸ See *ibid.*, fol. 233v: γνώσει δὲ τὴν κρίσιν τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς τὴν 'Αγαθονίκην γράμματος καὶ κοπασάτω ἢ θραύσις τοῦ θορυβοῦντος ὑμᾶς τοιοῦτου λογισμοῦ, ἵνα ἐν γαλήνῃ ψυχῆς τὰ σωτηριώδη ἔργα προθύμως διανύητε. *Ibid.*, fols. 221v-222r: 'Αναλογίζου τὴν σπουδὴν ἣν ἐνεδείξω πρὸς τὸ ἐξελεῖν αὐτὴν τοῦ κόσμου, διανοοῦ τὴν ἐν ἀρχῇ αὐτῆς πρὸς σε πληροφορίαν ἀγαθὴν, τὸν χρόνον τῆς μετὰ σοῦ διαγωγῆς, τὴν πολυειδῆ κυβέρνησιν ἣν ἀνεδείξω καὶ ἐν δεικνύεις πρὸς αὐτήν, τὰς θλίψεις ἃς ἐδάστασας διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῆς. κατανόει τὴν τελείαν ταύτης ἀκτημοσύνην, τὸ ἀσχετον πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους καὶ τὸν μακρυσμὸν τῶν προσηκόντων αὐτῇ κατὰ γένος, τὰς ἐπὶ τῇ πτώσει μεταμελείας αὐτῆς.

Upon learning of her intentions, Theoleptos did not conceal his annoyance. Not only did he unequivocally forbid such a move but he also complained to Eulogia that by her pettiness she challenged the very effectiveness of his own teaching whose aim had been to instil in her patience and continence above all.¹⁹ Adherence to these traditional monastic virtues is a recurrent theme in these letters of Theoleptos. There is, of course, nothing original about such instructions which are commonplace in ascetic literature, but neither can there be any doubt that in directing a woman who had been no stranger to luxury and power Theoleptos must have found it necessary to lay special emphasis on the virtues he described as the soul's defenders against desire and anger, and the progenitors of love and humility.²⁰ For though there is no evidence that Eulogia had difficulty practicing asceticism,²¹ patience was the weak link in her armor. Proud and authoritarian, she did not suffer easily ingratitude and insubordination. According to Theoleptos, the cause of her distressing quarrel with Agathonike, the nun she had particularly favored, was an act of impertinence on the latter's part.²² The

¹⁹ See *ibid.*, fol. 220r: Οἶδας καὶ ἀκριβῶς οἶδας ὅτι τὸ πλεῖον τῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς λόγων πρὸς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἔωρα ὅτι μὴ πρὸς τὴν ὑπομονήν· πάντοτε γὰρ τοῖς πυκνοῖς ψεκασμοῖς τῆς ἐγκρατείας καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ἐπαινέτο σου ἡ ψυχὴ.

²⁰ See *ibid.*, fol. 221r: Ἡ ἐγκράτεια τὸ φιλήδονον ἀναιρεῖ θέλημα, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ τὸ κενόδοξον καταργεῖ φρόνημα. ἡ ἐγκράτεια καὶ ἡ ὑπομονὴ κατὰ τοῦ θυμοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας στρατοπεδεύουσιν.

²¹ Eulogia was, in fact, commended for her ascetic exertions by Matthew of Ephesos, a long time associate of Theoleptos; cf. Τῇ βασιλίᾳ, ed Reinsch, *Die Briefe des Matthaios von Ephesos* (as in note 1 *supra*), no. 44, 161, lines 21-24: Τί γὰρ τῶν ἐπὶ τὴν μακαρίαν ἐκείνη ζωὴν φερόντων οὐ θερμῶς καὶ γενναίως ἐνδείκνυσαι; οὐ νηστείας καὶ ἀγρυπνίας ἐκτῆκεις τὴν σάρκα καὶ τοῦ φυσικοῦ δεσμοῦ διαλύσαι φιλονεικεῖς; οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα αἶρεις καὶ μεθιστᾷς τοῦ σώματος;

²² *Ottob.* 405, fol. 220r: Ἡ μὲν τῆς προπετείας παλγνιον γίνεται, σὺ δὲ τῆς μικροψυχίας δοῦλῃ καθίστασαι, ἐγὼ δὲ δι' ἑκάτερα τῇ λύπῃ μαστίζομαι, τοὺς ἡμῶς πόνους εἰς οὐδὲν κέρδος καταβληθέντας ὁρῶν. *Ibid.*, fol. 222v: Ὁ πονηρὸς τὴν ἀδελφὴν ταράσσει δι' ὑπονοίας καὶ προπετείας... σὲ δὲ πάλιν ταράσσει διὰ τῆς μικροψυχίας. *Ibid.*, fol. 223r: Διανοοῦ καὶ τὸν τῆς συνειδήσεώς σου μετέμελον καὶ τὸν παρὰ τῶν εὐφρονούντων ὀνειδισμόν ὃν εὐρήσεις ἔαν ἐκ μικροψυχίας ἀπολύσης αὐτήν.

abbess did not report the incident to her director, but the repentant offender wrote to Theoleptos begging him to intervene on her behalf, and he had no difficulty convincing Eulogia not to expel Agathonike from the convent.²³ But the effect of his counseling was not a lasting one. Years later, her other mentor found it necessary to censure Eulogia's pettiness and her outbursts of temper.²⁴ Theoleptos also hints at her severity as a disciplinarian when he advises her

²³ See *ibid.*, fols. 226v-227r: 'Εγὼ δὲ διελθὼν ἑκατέρων τὰ γράμματα, ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἀδελφῆς ξμαθον ὅτι ἐλύπησέ σε, σὺ δὲ οὐκ ἐδήλωσας, καὶ διακρίνω ἀπὸ τῶν ταύτης ῥημάτων ὅτι ἀφορμὰς ταραχῆς δεξαμένη διεκρούσω ταύτας καὶ ὑπέμεινας, ἐμοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἐδήλωσας, ἵνα μήτε ὡς ἐγκαλοῦσα φανῇς, μήτε λυπῆσθης με. σὲ μὲν οὖν ἐπήνεσα καὶ ἀπεδεξάμην τῆς οἰκονομίας ἔνεκα καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς κυδερνήσεως ἣν ἐπιδείκνυσαι εἰς τὴν σωτηρίαν τῆς ἀδελφῆς καὶ εὐχομαι ἵνα καὶ ἐτι μέχρι τέλους ἐπιμένῃς εἰς τὴν τῆς ὑπομονῆς διάθεσιν, τὴν δὲ ἀδελφήν πάλιν ἠλέησα καὶ συγγνώμης ἡξίωσα ἔνεκα τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως καὶ τῆς γνησίας μεταμελείας... εἰς πληροφορίαν δὲ σὴν ἐγχαράττω καὶ τὰ ῥήματα τῆς αὐτομεψίας καὶ τῆς ἐξαγορεύσεως αὐτῆς. τούτων τῶν ταπεινῶν ῥημάτων μεμνημένη διὰ παντός, κράτει τὴν ὑπομονὴν ἀσφαλῶς καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης πέψιν λύπης ἐργάζου, ταῖς ῥανίσι τῆς μακροθυμίας σθενύνουσα τὴν φλεγμονὴν τῆς τραχυνομένης καὶ τὴν ἀγαθὴν μεταβολὴν ταύτης ἐκδεχομένη. Just the word ἀφέθησαν, scribbled on the margin, indicates Eulogia's acquiescence. Theoleptos' letter to Agathonike has not survived, but fols. 197r-218r of the *Ottobonianus* have preserved a discourse which, according to its superscription, was to serve as a reminder of the metropolitan's admonitions to Eulogia and Agathonike: Μερικὴ διατράνωσις πρὸς ὑπόμνησιν ἀγοῦσα τῶν παρὰ τοῦ ταπεινοῦ Φιλαδελφείας Θεολήπτου διαφόρως λεχθέντων τῇ σεβασμιωτάτῃ βασιλίσῃ Εὐλογίᾳ μοναχῇ καὶ τῇ μετ' αὐτῆς καὶ ὑπ' αὐτὴν Ἀγαθονίκη μοναχῇ. This is a long disquisition on spiritual perfection and the ways to attain it, but it contains no other allusion to the quarrel between the two women, except a warning, at the end, that unless they heeded his advice, he would stop writing to them in the future.

²⁴ See *Scorialensis*, fol. 252v (Letter 19):... τὸ δὲ κατὰ τῆς Μάρθας «τὰ καὶ τὰ» φθέγγασθαί σε, εἰ μὲν ἐξ ἀπαθoῦς διανοίας ἐλέγετο χάριν τοῦ παιδευθῆναι καὶ ῥυθμισθῆναι ὡς πρὸς ἄνθρωπον, ἀναίτιον ἂν ἦν καὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ἡρτημένον, νῦν δὲ ὅτι θυμὸς ἐστὶν ὃ ταῦτα θάλλων καὶ ἀκοντίζων, ἔξω κείται τῶν ὁρῶν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιμελητέον πρῶτον τοῦ θυμικοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς, εἶτα μετὰ παρησίᾳς παιδευτέον τοὺς ἄλλους.

to be gentle with a nun whom she had «removed from the infidels,» noting that too rigorous a regimen could have an adverse effect on the woman.²⁵

Though Theoleptos counseled patience with first offenders and novices, he had no lenience for acts of willful disobedience. He was dismayed at Eulogia's decision to readmit to the convent a certain arrogant nun who had left of her own will and he expressed doubt about the successful rehabilitation of such a rebellious nature so ill-suited to monastic obedience.²⁶ He also prescribed severe punishment for nuns who engaged in fist fights. They were to be chastened by a regimen of genuflections to tire out the body, fasting to subdue the temper and intense prayer to elevate the mind. She who raises her fists against her neighbor, he wrote, cannot raise her

²⁵ See *Ottobonianus* 405, fol. 228v: Τὴν ἀνθρωπον ἦν ἀπέστησας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἀπὸ σοῦ μακρὰν ἀναστρεφομένην ἀνεζήτησας καὶ εἰσήγαγες πρὸς ἑαυτήν, μετὰ κυβερνήσεως ῥύθμιζε, μήπως ὑπὸ τῆς σκληρότητος δράση τι τῶν οὐ προσηκόντων. It is possible that this woman was one of the prisoners of war whom, according to Gregoras (*Hist.*, XXIX, 22: III, 238, line 18), Choumnaina had ransomed.

²⁶ See *ibid.*, fols. 228v-229v: Περὶ τῆς ἐξελεύσεως ἐκ τῆς μονῆς κακῶς, εἰσελθούσης δὲ πάλιν εἰς τὴν μονήν, οὐκ οἶδα πῶς, πολὺν ἔχω τὸν δισταγμὸν· ἀμφιβάλλω γὰρ ἔτι εἰ μεταμελήται πρεπόντως καὶ προήρηται εἰρηνεύειν καθ' αὐτήν καὶ μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν, ὅμως δὲ δοκεῖ μοι λέγω σοι κατὰ συμβουλήν. τὸ μὲν εὐρίσκεισθαι ταύτην ἔνδον τῆς μονῆς καὶ οἰκεῖν τὸ κελλίον ἐν ᾧ κατέμενε πρότερον καὶ ἔχειν τὴν παρὰ σοῦ τιμὴν καὶ ἀγάπην καὶ κυβερνήσιν καὶ τὴν ἐν ἀσθενείᾳς ἐπίσκεψιν ὠφελεῖ ἑκατέρας· ἐκείνην μὲν ὡς ἔχουσιν τὴν ἀνήκουσαν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ τὴν συνήθη καταμονήν, σὲ δὲ πάλιν ὡς ἐν τῷ σῷ κελλίῳ ἡσυχάζουσιν καὶ ἀφορμὰς μὴ μεσολαθεῖν τοῦ περισπᾶσθαι. τὸ δὲ κοινωνὸν ἔχειν ταύτην, ὡς καὶ τὰς μετὰ σοῦ, ἀσύμβατον μοι δοκεῖ. οὔτε γὰρ αὕτη, ὡς νομίζω, τοῦ ἰδίου φρονήματος ὑποχαλάσει ποτὲ πρὸς ὑποταγὴν καὶ μαθεῖν καταδέξεται, καὶ σοι πάλιν οὐ συμφέρει ὅλως τοῖς ταύτης θελήμασιν ἔπεσθαι· οὓς γὰρ ἡ γνώμη διίστησι, τούτοις ἢ ἔξωθεν ἔννοισι ἀνενόχλητος οὐ συναντᾷ.

hands in prayer: «she will be offering the most gentle Jesus not incense but the fumes of anger.»²⁷

Since she was responsible for the spiritual welfare of all the souls in her charge, Theoleptos instructed Eulogia to supervise even the upbringing of a little girl entrusted to one of the nuns for reasons of security and education. «A complete separation from you,» he wrote, «may incline the child to harmful desires and strange habits.»²⁸

Among the other duties that he assigned to the abbess was the care of the sick. If possible, she was to attend to her sick sisters with her own hands and to be present when someone gave up the ghost. The agony of death would help to remind her of the vanity of this world and to urge her on to ascetic exertions.²⁹

²⁷ See *ibid.*, fols. 227r-227v: Εἰ που θεάσῃ τινὰ τῶν μοναχῶν χεῖρας ἀτάκτους ἐκχέουσαν καὶ πλήττουσαν τὴν πλησίον, κώλυε τοῦτο σοφῶς καὶ κόλαζε σφοδρῶς, γονυκλισίαις εἰς κόπον τοῦ σώματος, νηστείαις εἰς τὴν τοῦ θυμοῦ κατακοίμησιν, προσευχῇ συντόνῳ εἰς ἀνάστασιν τοῦ λογισμοῦ πρὸς συντριβὴν καὶ ταπείνωσιν, διδάσκουσα τὴν ἀνοήτως χεῖρας ἐκτείνουσαν ἐννοεῖν τὴν δύναμιν τῆς κατὰ τὸν στίχον εὐχῆς, τὸν λέγοντα κατευθυνθήτω ἡ προσευχή μου ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου, ἔπαρσις τῶν χειρῶν μου θυσία ἐσπερινή (Ps. 140 (141): 2-3) ἢ γὰρ θρασυνομένη κατὰ τῆς πλησίον καὶ πυγμαῖς δάλλουσα ταύτη, ἀντὶ θυμιάματος, θυμοῦ καπνὸν εἰσφέρει τῷ πρασάτῳ Ἰησοῦ, ἀντὶ δὲ θυσίας ἐσπερινῆς, πληγὰς καὶ μώλωπας ἐπάγει τῷ ἐν ἐσπέρᾳ τῶν αἰώνων ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν μωλωπισθέντι καὶ θυσίαν ἑαυτὸν ἀνενεγκόντι.

²⁸ See *ibid.*, fol. 230r: Τὴν διὰ τὸ νεαρὸν τῆς ἡλικίας παραδοθεῖσαν πρὸς μοναχὴν παιδα, παιδείας ἔνεκα καὶ ἀσφαλείας, χειραγώγει καὶ σὺ ταῖς κατὰ καιροῦς νουθεσίαις ἀναθεωροῦσα τὴν ταύτης ἀγωγὴν, εἰ καλῶς προδιδάζεται, μήπως ὁ παντελὴς ἀπὸ σοῦ μακρυσμὸς ἐπιρρίψῃ ταύτην εἰς ἀσυντελεῖ θελήματα καὶ παράλογον συνήθειαν.

²⁹ See *ibid.*, fols. 233v-234r: Ἐπισκέπτου τὰς ἀσθενούσας ἀδελφάς, εἰ δυνατόν καὶ χερσὶν ἰδίαις περὶ διακονεῖν αὐταῖς. ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς ψυχορραγούσης ἀδελφῆς παρίστασο καὶ βλέπε τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐξόδῳ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγωνίαν· τοῦτο φέρει καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν ζωὴν ματαιότητος καὶ καταφρόνησιν. οὐκοῦν δὲ καὶ διεγείρει πρὸς ἀγῶνας ἀσκητικούς τὴν ψυχὴν.

As for Eulogia's personal complaints of depression, Theoleptos attributed them to her unwillingness to break with the past. Her continuous attachment to her family, her craving for their affection and her bitterness at their attempts to deprive her of part of her dowry were, in his opinion, at the root of her emotional distress.³⁰ «You sold your possessions,» he reminded her, «you renounced your parents, your brothers, your relatives, your friends... even your own body. In exchange for all this, you gained the precious pearl — Christ Jesus Who is every blessing and above every blessing! Having Christ, you have every blessing. What is it that you miss and you are complaining? What is it that you lack and you are upset?»³¹

Although we do not possess Eulogia's answers to the letters of Theoleptos, her reaction to his instructions is registered in the brief comments she scribbled on the margin as she was reading his let-

³⁰ See his second letter to Eulogia, fols. 238r-239r: Εἰ τὴν παρὰ τῶν τεκόντων κολακείαν καταδέχη, εἰ τὴν τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐντυχίαν ἐπιποθεῖς, εἰ τὴν τῶν συγγενῶν ὁμιλίαν στέργεις, εἰ τὴν συνήθειαν τοῦ κόσμου φιλεῖς προσεγγίζεις σοι, εἰ τῶν προικῶν ἀντέχῃ πραγμάτων, καὶ οἰκήματα καὶ ἀγροὺς παρακατέχεις, καὶ ἄλλο τι τῶν ἐπιγείων παρὰ σοὶ μένει, πῶς ἔρεῖς μετὰ τοῦ Παύλου, ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐστὶ ὡς τὰ ὕρωται (Gal. 6:14), τοῦ κόσμου ζῶντος καὶ σφριγῶντος ἐν σοι; εἰ δὲ τούτοις ἅπασιν ἀπετάξω, νῦν δὲ ὁρῶσα τὴν παρὰ τῶν γεννησάντων ἀφαίρεσιν τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τὴν παρ' αὐτῶν ἀποστροφὴν καὶ τοῦ βουλομένου παντὸς καταφρόνησιν, θορυβῇ καὶ ταράττῃ καὶ ποτε μὲν τὸ δόρυ τῆς λύπης καὶ τῆς ὀργῆς καὶ τῆς μνησικακίας βάλλει σε, ποτὲ δὲ ταῖς ἐκ τῆς γλώσσης ἀντιλογίαις τοξεύεις τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας, πῶς πάλιν εἶπες τὸ ἐπαγόμενον τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς ῥήσεως, καὶ γὰρ ἐστὶ ὡς τὰ ὕρωμαι τῷ κόσμῳ (Gal. 6:15), τῆς ψυχῆς συνδεδεμένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας σαρκὶ καὶ κόσμῳ;

³¹ See *ibid.*, fol. 237r: Ἐπώλησας πάντα σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ἀπέλυσας γονεῖς, ἀδελφοὺς, συγγενεῖς, φίλους, συνήθεις, χρήματα, οἰκήματα, κτήματα, καὶ αὐτὸ σου τὸ σῶμα. ἀντὶ δὲ πάντων τούτων, ἔκτησω τὸν πολῦτιμον μαργαρίτην Χριστόν, τὸν ὄντα πᾶν ἀγαθὸν καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ἀγαθόν. Χριστὸν κτησαμένη, τὸ πᾶν ἀγαθὸν ἔχεις. τί σοι λείπεται καὶ ἀγανακτεῖς; τίνος ὑστερεῖ καὶ δυσχεραίνεις;

ters. These notes are nothing but a series of exclamations on the sagacity and piety of the man she calls the «teacher of wisdom.»³²

Eulogia was thirty-one years old when the Metropolitan of Philadelphia died. His loss threw her into a paroxysm of sorrow.³³ Writing to her new director more than ten years later, she painted a grim picture of her existence without the benefit of Theoleptos' guidance and restraint. «Freed from its yoke of spiritual submission to the metropolitan,» she avowed, «my mind fell prey to the wild beasts and became a prisoner and drowned.»³⁴

In the ten to fifteen years which intervened between the death of Theoleptos and her acquaintance with the learned hesychast to whom are addressed her surviving letters, the young abbess had other spiritual advisers but she confessed to her new mentor that only he and the metropolitan of Philadelphia had touched her soul.³⁵ Unfortunately the identity of the man who so successfully replaced Theoleptos and inspired in his spiritual daughter the same

³² See fol. 224r (right - hand margin): θαυμασία συμβουλή! Fol. 236v (left-hand margin): τῖς σοφὸς καὶ συνήσει ταῦτα; (Ps. 106 (107): 43); Fol. 241r (right-hand margin): ὄρα παράκλησιν! Fol. 245r (right hand margin): ὄρα καὶ πάλιν σοφίας διδασκαλίαν καὶ θαύμαζε!

³³ Eulogia's grief and despair are attested by the discourse which Matthew of Ephesos addressed to her at the time, admonishing her to cease behaving like a woman and to show instead the «masculine spirit» (ἀρρενωπὸν) which had been her hallmark all along; cf. Τῇ βασιλίσῃ παραινετικὸς ἐξ αὐτοσχεδίου συντεθειμένος ἐπὶ τῇ τελευτῇ τοῦ Φιλαδελφείας κυροῦ Θεολήπτου, ed. L. Previale, «Due monodie inedite di Matteo di Efeso,» *BZ*, 41 (1941), 26-31. Eulogia's father offered similar advice in his eulogy of Theoleptos; cf. *Anecdota Graeca*, V, 184 and 185.

³⁴ *Scorialensis*, fol. 245v (Leter 15): Ὅθεν ἐξ ὅτου τοῦ ζυγοῦ τῆς νοεῖας ὑποταγῆς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἀφείθη, ἔκτοτε θηριάλωτος καὶ αἰχμάλωτος γέγονε καὶ κατεποντίσθη.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, fol. 247r:... ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου τὸν λόγον σου ὅλον, οὐδενὸς ἄλλου ὀρεῶ ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Φιλαδελφείας μέχρι τοῦ νῦν. See also the passage quoted in note³⁸ below, where Eulogia speaks of her «other directors» -- including Theoleptos -- whose precepts she failed to observe.

strong attachment remains elusive. According to the evidence in his correspondence, he was a hesychast who lived in the outskirts of Constantinople in the company of another monk.³⁶ He had come to the capital from Thessalonica after the death of Andronikos II in 1332 and had never met that emperor nor for that matter was he acquainted with Nikephoros Choumnos or Theoleptos.³⁷ Laurent

³⁶ He lived at some distance from Eulogia's convent which was situated near the cathedral of St. Sophia, for he complained that he had to walk through the center of the city in order to visit her; cf. *Scorialensis*, fol. 238r (Letter 8): ... βαδίζειν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἴσως ὀκνήσω τοσαυτάκις διὰ μέσης τῆς πόλεως. He was obviously not a member of a cenobitic monastery or he would not have depended on the princess for mere sustenance nor for such standard religious books as the Pentateuch and the books of Kings; cf. *ibid.*: 'Ο αὐτὸς δέ μοι καὶ περὶ τῆς σωματικῆς χρείας λόγος ἦς ἡμᾶς... ἀξιοῖς ἀφθονώτατα· εἰ μὲν γὰρ μὴ συνεχῶς καὶ δαψιλῶς ἡμῖν τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπὶ γίνεσθαι... ἡμέτερον ἂν ἦν ὧν δεόμεθα λέγειν. Fol. 241r (Letter 10): ...πρὸς δὲ τὸ παρὸν, εἰ τὰ Μωσαϊκὰ σοι εὐρίσκονται καὶ τὸ τετραβασίλειον, πεμφθήτωσάν μοι. In his letters he speaks of a companion, the monk Menas, to whom he was indebted for having shared with him his meagre possessions before Eulogia became their patroness; cf. fols. 250v-251r (Letter 17): ...δοσις (Μηνᾶς) με πολλάκις καὶ ἐπιτιμῶντα αἰδεῖται καὶ διδάσκοντα στέργει καὶ πάντα ἀκολουθεῖ μοι· καὶ πρὸ τῆς σῆς χορηγίας πάντα παρεῖχεν ὥστε εἶχεν... μὴδὲν ἴδιον ἑαυτοῦ ποιούμενος μὴδ' ἀφορίζων. He did not live, therefore, in complete solitude, but neither was he the leader of a group of anchorites, as Laurent thought, misinterpreting a passage where Eulogia calls her director a true follower of Christ and not a leader of his own followers; cf. «La direction spirituelle» (as in note 2 *supra*), 58 and note 1; also fol 238v (Letter 9): ...οὕτω καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, οὕτω καὶ οἱ κατὰ σὲ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ (Χριστοῦ).

³⁷ It is not known whether he was a native of Thessalonica, but he had lived there before coming to Constantinople because he wrote to Eulogia that he had left in that city the finished copies of his works; cf. *Scorialensis*, fol. 236v (Letter 4): ...καὶ εἰσιν οὐχ οἷους ἐγὼ τούτους μετὰ ταῦτα κατέστησα καὶ ἀφήκα ἐν τῇ Θεσσαλονίκῃ, ἀλλ' ὥς ἂν τις εἴποι ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς λοχείας ληφθέντες, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀσπούδαστοι. He knew neither Andronikos II nor Choumnos, for Eulogia wrote that he was the scholar monk for whom both her father and father-in-law had searched in vain and that had they been alive, his literary talents would not have remained unnoticed; cf. fols. 237r-237v (Letter 5): Ποῦ τὸ πνεῦμα σου, φυσικὴ φιλόσοφε καὶ φιλολογώτατε... αὐθέντη καὶ πενθερέ, καὶ σοφώτατε πάτερ ὁ ἐμὲ γεγεννηκώς; ἰδοὺ φίλος ὃν ἐζητεῖτε! ἰδοὺ μοναχὸς οἷους ὁμιλοῦντες ἡγάλλεσθε!... εἰ γὰρ παρήσαν ἐκεῖνοι, εἰ καὶ δευτάτῳ ποδὶ φεύγεις σὺ τὴν δόξαν, δευτέροις ἂν ἐκεῖνοι τοῖς ποσὶ τῆς τιμῆς... κατεδίωξαν ἂν καὶ κατέλαβον.

thought that Theoleptos' successor was a former student of the metropolitan and therefore another Philadelphian, but a more careful perusal of the passage he adduces as evidence shows that Eulogia is there referring to herself and not to her new director as the student of Theoleptos who failed to observe that prelate's precepts.³⁸ In fact there is no indication in the letters that the new director had known Theoleptos. On the contrary, his asking Eulogia to send him the writings of Theoleptos and particularly his comment that they must be excellent because they met with her approval could not have been made by a man who was familiar with the metropolitan and his works.³⁹

Like his distinguished predecessor, however, the new mentor had had the benefit of a classical education and had even written a discourse in its defense.⁴⁰ Among his other works were an exhortatory *Alphabetos* and some writings in honor of Patriarch Athana-

³⁸ See Laurent, «La direction spirituelle» (as in note 2 *supra*), 55 and note 6; and *Scorialensis*, fol. 239r (Letter 9): Καὶ κατεβαπτίσθην ἂν ὑπὸ τῆς λύπης, εἰ μὴ ἑμαυτὴν ἐμβριθῶς ἐπιτιμήσασα ἀνεκτησάμην ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, ταῦτα εἰποῦσα· «ἵνα τί καὶ σὺ οὐκ εἰσέρχῃ καὶ τοὺς πρὸς Θεὸν τρέχοντας κωλύεις; ἢ οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι οἰκονομία Θεοῦ ταῦτα διὰ τὴν σὴν ἀναξιοσύνην... καὶ γὰρ ὥς οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων πατέρων ἐφύλαξας, καὶ πρό γε τῶν ἄλλων, τοῦ σου πατρὸς καὶ δεσπότη. τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως... οὕτω καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποιήσεις.»

³⁹ *Scorialensis*, fol 237v (Letter 8): ...λοιπὸν δὲ ἡμῖν ἰδεῖν καὶ τὰ θατέρου πατρὸς, ἃ μὴ μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα τίνα εἶναι οὐκ εἰκός, σου θαυμαζούσης ταῦτα καὶ οὕτω πρεσβευσούσης.

⁴⁰ *Scorialensis*, fol. 241v (Letter 12): Τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ἔχει λόγους ὑπὲρ τῶν λόγων πρὸς τοὺς οὐκ ἀγαθὸν οἰομένους τὸν λόγον.

sios I of Constantinople.⁴¹ He was not an old man but his health was failing and he preferred to live in seclusion.⁴² He had never acted as a spiritual director before, yet his advice was sought not only by other women but also by bishops and even by the patriarch himself.⁴³

The circumstances leading to his acquaintance with the princess are unknown.⁴⁴ Their correspondence is incomplete, consisting of

⁴¹ *Ibid.*: ...ἔχει καὶ στίχους ἱαμβικούς καὶ τινὰς ἡρωϊκούς ...ὧν τοὺς μὲν εὐχερεῖς εἶναι συμβαίνει γνῶναι ...οἱ δὲ τι καὶ βαθύτερον ἔχουσι τοῦ προχείρως νοουμένου. εἰσὶ δὲ τοιοῦτοι οἱ κατ' ἀλφάβητον καταταχθέντες, ἐμφασὶν τινὰ πνευματικὴν ἔχοντες καὶ ἡσυχίας καρπὸν, οὐκ ἂπ' ἐμοῦ ἀλλὰ τῶν πατερικῶν ἐξελεγμένον πόνων. Eulogia was particularly interested in her correspondent's writings on Patriarch Athanasios, copies of which were kept at the double convent founded by that prelate in the City. Curiosity, as Laurent notes, must have been partly her motive, because that austere patriarch had been an outspoken critic of her own father; cf. «La direction spirituelle» (as in note 2 above), 62; and fols. 236r-236v (Letter 4): Εὐρηνται δὲ ἡμῖν οἱ παρόντες τῶν λόγων, οὓς μάλιστα ἐξήτεις, ἐν τοῖς μοναστηρίοις Ἀθανασίου τοῦ πάνυ.

⁴² Eulogia remarked that her director's works showed exceptional maturity for a young man; cf. fol 242v (Letter 13): Τί τῶν σῶν λόγων οὐ θαυμαστόν; ...τί οὐκ ἐμφανίζουσιν οὗτοι; οὐκ ἐν νεαρᾷ ἡλικίᾳ πρεσβυτικωτάτην σύνεσιν; οὐ πρὸ καιροῦ τῆς ἀκριβείας τῆς μοναχικῆς καὶ πολιτείας ἀκροτάτην ἀκριβειαν; For his complaint of chronic asthma attacks, see the long excerpt from Letter 18 translated by Laurent, «La direction spirituelle.» 58.

⁴³ See fol 244r (Letter 14): ... πρὸς δὲ σύστασιν ἐτέρων, καὶ ὅλως τὴν ἑξω διαγωγὴν, ἔοικα παντὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀδυνατώτατος εἶναι. Fol. 249v (Letter 17): Τί δὲ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων γυναικῶν αἷς οὐδαμῶς μετεδίδουν ἐνδιαθέτου γνώμης, καίτοι πολλὰ ζητούσαις; ...ἐγὼ γὰρ τοὺς ἄλλους φίλους καὶ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ αὐτὸν πατριάρχην, οἷς με ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἐμαυτὸν δι' ὀλίγου διδόναι, οὐ δίδωμι ἄνευ μεγάλης ἀνάγκης, αὐτὸ τοῦτο αὐτοῖς προβαλλόμενος, τὴν ἀναχώρησιν.

⁴⁴ It is possible, however, that the director's first letter which is missing and in which, judging from Eulogia's answer, he had expressed his esteem and respect for her, was an attempt on the part of the impoverished author to obtain the patronage of the wealthy abbess: cf. fol. 235r (Letter 1): Τοῖνυν τὴν γραφὴν τῆς ἀγιωσύνης σου καὶ εὐχαριστῶ καὶ ἐπαινῶ καὶ θαυμάζω. εὐχαριστῶ μὲν διὰ τοὺς ἐπαίνους ...διὰ τὴν ἀγαθὴν σου διάθεσιν καὶ ὑπόληψιν περὶ ἐμοῦ.

twenty-two letters, eight of which are by the abbess and fourteen by her director. They were all written within the period of one year,⁴⁵ sometime after the death of Andronikos II in 1332 and before the death of Eulogia's brother John Choumnos in 1338.⁴⁶ They have been preserved in a 14th century miscellany at the library of the Escorial which must have belonged to the abbess or to someone from her entourage in the anti-Palamite camp.⁴⁷ Fortunately the unknown scribe who copied the letters was no scholar, for he did not tamper with Eulogia's spelling or syntax and thus he preserved

⁴⁵ Letters 1-16 are an exchange in chronological order and, although Eulogia's letters stop at this point, the remaining letters by her director are sequential. Since Letter 9 was written shortly after the feast of the Transfiguration of the Savior (6 August) and Letter 21 shortly after the annual memorial service for Eulogia's father (16 January; on the date of Choumnos' death, see Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos*, 62 note 10), we may safely assume that the entire correspondence is encompassed within the limits of one year at the most.

⁴⁶ The *terminus post quem* is clearly indicated by Eulogia's statement that both her father (+ 1327) and Andronikos II (+ 1332) had the misfortune to die without meeting her correspondent; cf. note 37 *supra*. On the other hand, the date proposed as the *terminus ante quem* is more speculative, for it is deduced from a reference by her director to a meeting between Eulogia and a «man of the parakoi-momenos» (fol. 253v, Letter 21). It is highly probable that the reference is to the Parakoimomenos of the Great Seal John Choumnos, as suggested by Laurent, «La direction spirituelle», 52 (on the date of John's death, see Kouroules, *op. cit.* as in note 12 above, 191). But if this is not the case, the date of 1338 loses its significance. At any rate, the letters were written before the beginning of the Hesychast controversy in 1341, for they contain no reference to this dispute in which the abbess was so actively involved.

⁴⁷ They are found in the last folios (235r-254r) of the *codex Scorialensis* Φ-III-11 which contains, in addition, four letters of Akindynos and one letter of a close friend of Kyparissiotis. On this MS, see G. De Andrés, *Catálogo de los Códices Griegos de la Real Biblioteca de el Escorial* (Madrid, 1965), 2, 60-64; and my article «Some Notes on the Letters of Gregory Akindynos», *DOP*, 36 (1982) p. 222. The text of the letters is by a practiced hand, and this eliminates the possibility that the abbess herself might have been the copyist, for we know from her correspondent's complaint that she had a bad handwriting; cf. fol. 241r (Letter 10): Τὰ γράμματα δὲ ταῦτα εἰ δυσχεραίνεις ἀναγινώσκουσα διὰ τὸ κακοχάραγον, ἐνθυμοῦ τὰ σεαυτῆς.

an important facet of the education of this woman whom the flattery of her contemporaries would lead us to regard as another Anna Comnena. Eulogia's letters with their bad spelling, confused syntax, and only a mere sprinkling of scriptural and Patristic allusions, may have a refreshing spontaneity of expression and feeling, but they show that she was not a learned woman, not even a well-educated woman.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, she had a scholarly penchant, she

⁴⁸ Eulogia writes literary Koine Greek, the linguistic register long associated with technical writing and low style ecclesiastical literature (cf. R. Browning, «The Language of Byzantine Literature,» *The «Past» in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture*, S. Vryonis, ed. [Undena Publications, 1978], 110-111; 122), but her style is uneven. At times she is capable of producing well constructed sentences, spiced with such rhetorical devices as word play, alliteration, anaphora and rhetorical questions, e.g., fol. 236v-237r (Letter 5): 'Η γ α λ λ ι α σ ά μ η ν έ γ ώ έ π ι τ ά λ ό γ ι ά σ ο υ , , π ά τ ε ρ ά γ ι ε , ώ ς ό ε ύ ρ ί σ κ ω ν σ κ ύ λ α π ο λ λ ά (Ps. 117 (118): 162-163). μέσον δύο παθών μεταίχμιος γέγονα· ηύφρανθην τε πάνυ και λίαν έλυπήθην. ηύφρανθην μὲν διὰ τὴν καλλονὴν τῆς γραφῆς σου· τί γὰρ τῶν αὐτῆς οὐ λίαν θαυμάσιον; τὸ ρητορικὸν πυρὸς μένος πνέον, ἢ τὸ ἀγιοπρεπὲς καὶ εὐλαδέστατον καὶ συνετὸν καὶ πεπαιδευμένον τῆς παιδεύσεως ...ἢ πάλιν τὸ εὐπορώτατον τοῦ νοῦς καὶ πλάτος τῶν νοημάτων μετὰ θαυμασιωτάτης καὶ ἀδιάστου τῆς ἐξαγγελίας; στενοὶ με, πάτερ, τὸ πλάτος σου τῶν νοημάτων καὶ ἡ πολλὴ σου εὐπορία ἀπορεῖν με πεποίηκεν. Fol. 242v (Letter 13): Τί τῶν σῶν λόγων οὐ θαυμαστόν, ἀνθρῶπε τοῦ Θεοῦ; τί οὐκ ἐμφανίζουσιν οὗτοι; οὐκ ἐν νεαρᾷ ἡλικίᾳ πρεσβυτικωτάτην σύνεσιν; οὐ πρὸ καιροῦ τῆς ἀκριθείας τῆς μοναχικῆς καὶ πολιτείας ἀκροτάτην ἀκριθείαν; οὐ τῶν ἔξω γραφῶν καὶ τῶν θείων πολλὴν μελέτην καὶ σύνεσιν; οὐ τὸ πλάτος τῶν νοημάτων; οὐ τὴν εὐπορίαν τῶν λέξεων; οὐ τὸ εὐδρομον καὶ ὑψηλὸν τῆς φράσεως; At other times, on the other hand, she lapses into confused and disjointed syntax; e.g., fol. 246r (Letter 15): 'Ότι δὲ οὐκ ἐξέρχομαι ἐγὼ φιλονεικίαν ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ ὁ μὴ ποιῶ ἀπαιτῶ, ὥς μὴ εἶναι ἐντεῦθεν καθαρὰν τὴν πνευματικὴν μου διάθεσιν, ἀλλὰ πλεονάζει ταύτην τὸ ἑαυτῆς συμφέρον, παρὰ τῆς σῆς θεολήπτου ψυχῆς. *Ibid.*, fols. 246v-247r: 'Ό δεσπότης μου ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀπὸ ὀγδοὺς ἔτος ἐξελθὼν τοῦ κόσμου, ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ ἔτει τῆς ἡλικίας αὐτοῦ ἢ τῶν ἔξ αὐτοῦ ὠφελουμένων βοήθεια μάλλον ἐφώτισεν αὐτόν. Her imperfect grasp of syntax is further exemplified by her uncertainty about the use of cases. She substitutes the dative for the accusative (Letter 1, fol. 235r: ἔδοξάσμεν σοι, ὀχλεῖν σοι; Letter 15, fol. 244r: δεξιουῖσθαί σοι) and conversely the accusative for the dative (Letter 5, fol. 236v: ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἦν ἀφήκε τοὺς μαθητάς; Letter 13, fol. 241r: ὁ τοὺς σοὺς λόγους ὠμίληκώς) or she gives the genitive to verbs which take either the accusative or the dative; e.g. Letter 15, fol.

had been raised in a cultured environment and had a taste for literary discourse. This is what she particularly missed at the convent especially after the death of Theoleptos and her own erudite father,⁴⁹ and this is what constitutes the main theme of her correspondence with her new director: her need not only for spiritual guidance but also for literary intercourse.

Having heard of her future director's writings on Patriarch Athanasios, she wrote to request a copy and to invite the author himself to visit her.⁵⁰ She assured him that he would not find in her an

246v: οὐκ ἔκρινα τῆς ὕλης; *ibid.*, fol. 247r: συνευδοκεῖν τοῦ λόγου. Above all, as Eulogia herself admitted (cf. note 51 below), it is her spelling which betrays her lack of formal training in grammar. The following is just a representative list of her spelling errors: ἀντεστράφει (ἀντεστράφη), ἀνοίσωμεν (ἀνήσομεν), ἡδρύας (ὑδρίας), σκύλλα (σκύλα), μετέχμιος (μεταίχμιος), στενεῖμαι (στενοί με), δπλα ἀρετῆς (δπλα ἀρετῆς), χάριτι (χάρτη), δμιληκός (ὠμιληκώς), διαπείρου (διαπύρου), ἀστίως (ἀστεως), συγκένειαν (συγγένειαν). Finally the quotations in Eulogia's letters show no evidence of erudition. They are limited to such fundamental texts as the Bible (six quotations from the Psalms; one from Isaiah; three from St. Paul and one from the first epistle of St. John), the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (Arsenios, *Apophthegm.*, no. V), and five orations of Gregory of Nazianzus (*Or.* 2, 4, 21, 24, 42).

⁴⁹ See fol. 237^v (Letter 7): Τούτων τὴν στέρησιν μὴ φέρουσα, καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦ πνευματικοῦ μου πατρὸς, ὀδυνηρῶς ζῶ. μὴ εὐρίσκουσα τοίνυν ὀμιλίαν πνευματικὴν ἅμα καὶ λογικὴν, ὡς εἶναι ἀρτίαν καὶ τελείαν, ἀ π η ν ἡ ν α τ ο πα ρ α κ λ η θ ῆ ν α ι ἡ ψ υ χ ῆ μ ο υ (Ps. 76 (77):3) ... διὰ τοῦτο κεκίνηκέν με ἔνδον ἡ καρδία μου πρὸς ζήτησιν τῆς σῆς ὀμιλίας. In 1328 Manuel Gabalas wrote that Eulogia, who "liked the company of men distinguished in philosophy" (ἀνδράσιν ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ γνωρίμοις ἐθέλεις συγγίνεσθαι), had asked him at the time to visit her regularly, but he chose instead to send her a collection of his works which she could consult at any time without the mutual embarrassment of private conversations between the two of them (... πρὸς δὲ καὶ μήτ' ἐμέ σε δεδίττεσθαι τηλικαύτην γε οὐσαν καὶ σέ τε αὐτῇ κιστ' ἔχειν κατεπτηχέναι τῇ τῇ φύσει περιεχυμένῃ αἰδοῖ); cf. Τῇ Παλαιολογίῃ, ed. Reinsch, *Die Briefe des Matthaïos von Ephesos*, no. 32, 136-138; especially lines 7-8 and 42-44.

⁵⁰ See fol. 235r (Letter 1): ... πάνν τοι ἀξίῳ ἵνα μὴ ὑστερήσης με τὸ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου πατριάρχου κυροῦ Ἀθανασίου σύγγραμμα τῆς ἀγιωσύνης σου. Fol. 236r (Letter 3): ...παρέστω ἡ ζῶσα πηγὴ καὶ ἐπιδημείτω πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἡ ἀγιωσύνη σου, καὶ ἀνεξόμεθα τὴν στέρησιν τοῦ διὰ τῶν συγγραμμάτων ῥέοντος ποταμοῦ.

unworthy listener for, although her education had been neglected, as he could tell from her mistakes in grammar, she had been endowed by the grace of God with some innate intelligence.⁵¹ At the same time she sent him paper and money for the transcription of his works and when she received them she neglected all other duties until she had finished reading them.⁵² She then asked him to direct her by visiting her once a month and, when after two visits he protested that their meetings were a hazard to his spiritual salvation,⁵³ she used all available weapons to break down his resistance. She argued, she cajoled, she cried, while all the time she flattered his literary vanity and generously provided for his material comfort. Quoting St. Gregory of Nazianzus, she wrote: «I am fond of learning and cling to it. For this reason I seek your conversation; for it is not only to my spiritual [benefit] and edification... but it is also most erudite⁵⁴... I wait for your voice like the thirsty earth for the

⁵¹ See fol. 235r (Letter 1): ...παρεκινήθην τοῦ γράψαι ἵνα καὶ ἄμφω τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ καταλάβῃς, τὴν τε ιδιωτείαν καὶ ἀμαθίαν εἰς τὴν ἐπιστήμην τῆς γραμματικῆς ἐκ τῶν ἀντιστοιχῶν καὶ τῶν τόνων, καὶ τὴν μικρὰν δύναμιν εἰς τὸ νοεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης δωρεᾶς καὶ φιλανθρωπίας τοῦ ποιητοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης παιδεύσεως ἢ ἐρμηνείας· ἡ γὰρ ἂν καὶ γραμματικὴν ἐξεπαίδευσάν μοι, εἰ τοσαύτην εἶχον εἰς ἐμὲ ἐπιμέλειαν.

⁵² See fol. 237v (Letter 5): Οἰκονομοῦνται καὶ τῶν ἐπιλοίπων γραφῶν τὰ χαρτία. *Ibid.*, fol. 237r: Τοσοῦτόν με κατέθελξεν ἡ γραφή, ὥς πάντων τῶν ἀνὰ χεῖρας ἀναγκαιοτάτων ὄντων ἀμελήσασαν, εἰ μὴ τὸν πάντα λόγον ἐκπληρώσω, οὐκ ἀνῆκα.

⁵³ See fol. 244r (Letter 14): ...σοῦ δὲ ἔνεκα φροντίδα ἔχειν, ὥστε παραβάλλειν εἰς τὸ καλλίον σου μὴ πλεόν ἢ τρεῖς, ἢ τὸ πλείστον τετράκις τοῦ ἐνιαυσίου· πλεόν δὲ τούτου ἀδυνάτως ἔχω, ἐπὶ χαρᾶς λέγω τῆς συνειδήσεως... Δεῖ δὲ καθάπερ σεαυτῆς προμηθεύῃ καὶ καλῶς ποιοῦσα οὐδαμῶς ἐξέρεχθαι τῆς θεσπεσίας μονῆς, οὕτω καὶ ἡμῶν ποιήσασθαι λόγον εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι. τὴν πνευματικὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς διατεθεῖσα διάθεσιν.

⁵⁴ See fol. 240r (Letter 9): ... τοῦ λόγου δὲ ἀντέχομαί τε καὶ περιέχομαι (Greg. Naz., *Or.* IV, PG, 35, 636A) ... διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν ὁμιλίαν σου ζητῶ ὡς πνευματικὴν καὶ κατεργασίαν οὖσαν ... ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ ὡς λογιωτάτην.

rain.»⁵⁵ «I beg you for the sake of Christ Himself do not let me drown,» she pleaded, «my peace and happiness should not last only for a month and a half... I have had just a taste of relaxation and have been thrown again deeper into the sea to drown. I have written this not with ink but with my tears.»⁵⁶

Finally, after some mild protestations, he gave in and agreed to visit her every other month.⁵⁷ His own letters contain nothing original by way of spiritual guidance. His admonitions — so similar to those of his predecessor — show that Eulogia admired but did not practice all of Theoleptos' precepts. She shared with her nuns even the most menial tasks,⁵⁸ but her imperious manner created problems with the administration of the convent which her new mentor advised her to entrust to a capable assistant.⁵⁹ Like Theoleptos, he too warned Eulogia against the visits of her relatives which upset her emotionally and deplored her unbecoming outburst of grief at the memorial service for her father.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ See fol. 241r (Letter 11): ...ὥσπερ γὰρ γῆ διψῶσα προυδεχομένη τὸν ὑέτόν, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκδεχόμεθα τὴν σὴν λαλίαν.

⁵⁶ See Fols 245v-246r (Letter 15): ...παρακαλῶ διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν ...μὴ ἐάσης με καταποντισθῆναι ...μὴ ἔστω ἡ ἀνακωχή καὶ εὐδαιμονία μου ἐνδὸς μηνὸς καὶ ἡμίσεος μόνου ...γευσασμένην μόνον τῆς ἀνέσεως καὶ αὐθις πλέον καταποντισθεῖσαν. ταῦτα δάκρυσιν ἐγράφησαν μᾶλλον ἢ μέλανι.

⁵⁷ See fol. 250r (Letter 17): Ἔχε δὲ ὁμῶς τὸν ἕξ ἀριθμὸν ὃν με ᾔτησας...

⁵⁸ See Gregoras, *Hist.*, XXIX, 22: III, 238-239

⁵⁹ Fol. 252r (Letter 18): Καὶ οὐ λέγω παντελῶς ὑπὸ σοῦ περιοφθῆναι τὸ μοναστήριον καὶ διὰ τούτου τὰ τῷ Θεῷ ἀφιερωμένα σοι, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τὴν θαυμασίαν Ῥάλαιναν εὐτυχεῖς, οὕτως οὖσαν φρόνιμον καὶ δραστήριον, ὡς ἀκούω, καὶ εἰς ταῦτα καὶ πάντα, ἀρκεῖτω αὕτη τοῖς πράγμασι...

⁶⁰ See fol. 252v (Letter 19): Αἱ μὲν ἄλλαι ἀμέλειαι γινώσκεις ὁπόθεν συμβαίνουσίν σοι καὶ ῥαθυμίαι, ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς συγγενεῖς σου προσπαθοῦς ὁμιλίας... See also fol. 253v (Letter 21): Τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν μνημοσύνων ἐκπεφωνημένον κλαυθμὸν περιττὸν ἡγησάμην καὶ ἡσυχάζουση ψυχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν οὐ προσήκοντα.

Laurent tentatively identified Choumnaina's director with the hesychast Ignatios, known from the correspondence of Barlaam of Calabria.⁶¹ Until some new evidence comes to light, Laurent's identification remains an interesting hypothesis. A revered hesychast, Ignatios is not known to have supported Palamas. Whether he was also — as Laurent suggests — the author of the liturgical works in honor of Patriarch Athanasios which have survived under the

⁶¹ «La direction spirituelle» (as in note 2 *supra*), 64-68. Ignatios was among the first to protest when Barlaam began his attack against the hesychast method of prayer, but he was promptly reassured by the Calabrian that his criticism was not directed against the enlightened hesychasts of his caliber but against their naive brothers and their practices; cf. *Epist. V*, ed. G. Schiro, *Barlaam Calabro Epistole Greche. I primordi episodici e dottrinari delle lotte esicaste*, Istituto Siciliano di Studi byzantini e neogreci (Palermo, 1954), 323-324, lines 120-126.

Laurent's identification of Eulogia's director with Ignatios is based on the following inferences: a) an *Alphabetos* (ed. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, IV, 436-437 = PG, 117, 1176C - 1177B) and certain liturgical texts in honor of Patriarch Athanasios I of Constantinople (cf. the following note) are ascribed in the MSS which have preserved them to a monk Ignatios. b) Like Choumnaina's director, Ignatios was highly respected. He was in fact elected to the episcopate, but declined this honor; see Barlaam, *Epist. IV*, ed. Schiro, *op. cit.*, 315, lines 8-10. c) A monk Ignatios was among the leaders of the anti-Palamite faction at the council of 1351; cf. Arsenios of Tyre, *Project of Tome* (Vatic. gr. 2335, fol. 2r), as cited in Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude...*, 142 note 71. He is, in all probability, to be identified with the philosopher Ignatios cited in the list of prominent anti-Palamites; cf. G. Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone ...*, ST, 56 (Vatican City, 1931), 223, no. 8.

When Laurent proposed this identification, he was unaware of a letter of Akindynos which may add some strength to his hypothesis. This letter is addressed to an anonymous friend of the princess who had written a discourse against those who accused him of shunning the *ἡρεσούνη*; cf. A. Hero, ed. *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*, CFHB XXI, Dumbarton Oaks Texts VII (Washington, D.C. 1983), letter 6. If Laurent's identification is correct, then Akindynos might have been writing to Ignatios after the latter declined his unanimous election to the episcopate and swore on oath in confirmation of his irrevocable decision.

name of a hieromonk Ignatios, cannot at present be confirmed.⁶²

Loyalty to the house of her in-laws was undoubtedly what induced Eulogia to support the religious opponents of Kantakouzenos during the civil war of 1341-1347. Throwing herself heart and soul into the dispute, she put her wealth and influence at the service

⁶² Fols. 3r-37r and 134v-151v of the *cod. Const. Chalc.* 64 (Istanbul Patriarchate Library; collection of the monastery of Chalke, nunc 57, olim 64) contain two *akolouthiai* for Athanasios by a hieromonk Ignatios. See A.-M. Talbot, *Faith Healing in Late Byzantium* (Brookline, MA, 1983), 39-41. The *tridion* (fols. 151r-155r) and the *antiphons* (fols. 155v-156v) for Athanasios which appear in the MS directly after the second *akolouthia*, but without indication of author, may also be by Ignatios.

It is unfortunately impossible to tell from Eulogia's correspondence what her director's writings on Athanasios consisted of, but I agree with Laurent («La direction spirituelle,» 66) that the terms σύγραμμα/λόγοι by which they are described (Letter 1, fol. 235r; Letter 4, fol. 236v) point to more than a *vita*. Moreover, since it is impossible to compare liturgical and epistolary texts, no connection can be established between the author of the *akolouthiai* and Eulogia's correspondent on stylistic grounds.

Of the other known encomiasts of Athanasios, only Theoktistos is to be considered, since Joseph Kalothetos — the author of a *vita* (latest edition by D. Tsames, Ἰωσήφ Καλοθέτου Συγγράμματα, Θεσσαλονικεῖς Βυζαντινοὶ Συγγραφεῖς I (Thessalonike, 1980), 453-503) — was one of Choumnaina's most outspoken enemies, and the otherwise unknown Basil dedicated only a 9-line poem to Athanasios; cf. ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, «Zitija dvuh Vselenskih patriarhov XIV v., svv. Afanasija I i Isidora I,» *Zapiski istorikofilologiceskago fakul'teta Imperatorskago S. - Peterburgskago Universiteta*, 76 (1905), iii (Basil's name and work were kindly brought to my attention by Dr. Alice-Mary Talbot).

Theoktistos wrote both a *vita* (ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *op. cit.*, 1-51) and an oration on the translation of Athanasios' relics (ed. A.-M. Talbot, *Faith Healing in Late Byzantium* [Brookline, MA., 1983]), but Laurent rejects him because he is not known to have written any of the other works assigned to Eulogia's director (cf. «La direction spirituelle,» 66) and also because of stylistic reasons (cf. *ibid.*, 65). He argues firstly, that Theoktistos was extremely fond of quoting the ancient authors, whereas the director's letters are remarkably jejune in classical allusions and secondly, that Eulogia who shows in her letters a penchant for assonance and word-play would not have failed to make a pun on her correspondent's name, had he been named Theoktistos. I find Laurent's second argument more persuasive.

of the monk Akindynos, the opponent of Palamas. During the troubled days which followed his condemnation in July 1341, Eulogia sheltered Akindynos and whenever his enemies came looking for him, she appeared instead and engaged them in theological discussions.⁶³ She even wrote long letters in defense of Akindynos'

The dearth of classical allusions in the director's letters does not necessarily indicate the author's aversion to the rhetorical style. There is no doubt that he deliberately chose not to display his erudition because he was writing to a woman. Theoleptos' letters to Eulogia are written in an equally plain style. Be that as it may, what particularly argues against the identification of Theoktistos with Eulogia's protégé is the former's admiration for Eulogia's archenemy, Gregory Palamas, in whose honor he even wrote some verses; cf. ed. P. Chrestou Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ Συγγράμματα, II, 163.

⁶³ See Palamas, 7th *Antirrhetic*, 5, 10, ed. L. Kontoyannes - B. Phanourgakes, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ Συγγράμματα (Thessalonike, 1970), III, 468, lines 6-23: 'Ἦνίκα δ' ἂν ἐπιστάντας μάθοι τοὺς ἀντικειμένους τῇ πλάνῃ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνων ζητούμενον τοῦτον... τηνικαῦτα πάλιν ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις ἐπὶ μᾶλλον ἀδύτοις αὐτῇ κρύπτει τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ παρεῖναι μὲν οὐ φησιν ἐκείνον δυνατὸν εἶναι — οὐ γὰρ ἐθέλειν θορυβεῖν ὅλως — ἐαυτὴν δ' ἐτοίμην εἶναι διδάσκειν τὴν ἀκριβείαν τῶν δογμάτων καὶ ὑπερηγορεῖν εὐ μάλα τοῦ κρύψαντος ἑαυτὸν, μόνον εἰ τις ἐθέλοι παρ' αὐτῇ φοιτᾶν καὶ τὰ ὅσα ὑπέχειν ὡς διδασκάλῳ. οὐ γὰρ αὐτῆς εἶναι θεάτροις ἐπιδημεῖν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς προσιόντας διδάσκειν, ἀκριβῆ πείραν τῶν θείων ἐσχηκυίας δογμάτων, οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοὺς συνεληλυθότας μόνον δπαντας ἐπὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἐκείνων συνόδων... ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν τὸν κατ' εὐβουλίαν κρυπτόμενον. The vehemence of Palamas' invective is an indication of Eulogia's stature as an opponent. Instead of dismissing her as a fool or an ignoramus, he writes — not without sarcasm, of course — that she was a bolder and better (θαρραλεωτέρα καὶ υπερτέρα) polemicist than Akindynos himself; cf. *ibid.*, 468, line 23 - 469, line 15: Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τούτου τὴν ἀρχὴν ἠκροάσατο, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν γραφὴν ἔπειτα μετ' ἐπιστασίας ὅτι πλείστης, ἅτε καὶ πάμπαν ἐσχολακυία διερευνήσασα, τοσοῦτον ἐπιλαβέσθαι τῆς κατ' αὐτὴν ἐπιγνώσεως καὶ τοῦ διδάξαντος τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀκριβέστερον, ὥς ἔχειν καὶ παρρησιάζεσθαι ταύτην ἐκείνου μᾶλλον καὶ προασπίζειν ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις... ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐθόρμητός ἐστι καὶ διδασκαλός ἐν τοῖς θείοις δόγμασι τῶν ἀνδρῶν εἶναι φιλοτιμεῖται καὶ τῶν ὑπέκειν οὐκ ἐθελόντων ἀντίθετος καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ταύτην διδάξαντος θαρραλεωτέρα καὶ υπερτέρα, μὴ τὴν δεσποτικὴν αἰδουμένη ψῆφον, μὴ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἐντολὴν προσιεμένη...

doctrines and helped Patriarch Kalekas organize the first anti-Palamite synod in the spring of 1341 by sending there her relatives accompanied by a large retinue.⁶⁴ Choumnaina's conduct so scandalized Palamas that he devoted a whole invective to this «little woman invested with some authority,» as he calls her.⁶⁵ Comparing her to the patronesses of other notorious heretics, he accuses her of violating not only the Apostolic injunction against women teaching in the Church, but also human law since she was not a widowed empress like the pious Theodora, the restorer of orthodoxy, but a mere «servant of the emperors.»⁶⁶ Palamas' disciple, Joseph Kalot-

⁶⁴ Palamas declared that if he could show Eulogia's letters, he would prove to all that Siracides' saying — «There is no greater wickedness than the wickedness of a woman» — was true in her case; cf. *ibid.*, 469, lines 14-18: ...πρὸς μὲν τοὺς παρόντας ἐλευθεροστομεῖ, θρασυστομεῖ δ' εἰπεῖν οἰκειότερον, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἀπόντας καὶ γράμμασι χρῆται μακροῖς, ἅπερ εἶπερ ἐνταῦθα προθέσθαι νῦν ἐνῆν, πᾶς τις ἔγνω τὸ τοῦ Σιράχ ἐπ' αὐτῆς ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐκδᾶν, ὡς «οὐκ ἔστι κακία ὑπὲρ κακίαν γυναικός» Sirac. 25:19 On the anti-Palamite synod of May 1342, cf. Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude...*, 101; and Palamas, *Letter to Philotheos*, ed. N. Matsoukas, *Συγγράμματα*, II, 535, 13-18: ...τὴν λεγομένην σύνοδον, ἐν ἣ τῶν μὲν ἐκάστοτε κατ' ἔθος συνεδρευόντων ἀρχιερέων τῷ πατριάρχῃ συγκέκληται τις ἕτερος οὐδαμῶς, τῶν δ' ἀρχόντων οἱ τῆς Χουμναίνης συγγενεῖς βασιλείας καὶ τούτων οἱ τῶν ἄλλων νεώτεροι παρῆσαν ἐκεῖ δούλων κατάλληλον ἔσμον ἐπαγόμενοι. καὶ μεταξύ τούτων ὁ Ἀκίνδυνος ἦν...

⁶⁵ Palamas, 7th *Antirrhetic*, 5, 8-13, *Συγγράμματα*, III, 466-469; *idem*, *Letter to Arsenios*, ed. Matsoukas, *Συγγράμματα*, II, 323, lines 15-17: οὐχ ὑποπτήξομεν οὐδόλως, κἂν γυναικοῦ μανίαν περιβεβλημένου τινὰ δυναστείαν καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπάγεται...

⁶⁶ *Idem*, 7th *Antirrhetic*, 5, 12, 469, line 19 - 470, line 12. See especially 469, lines 25-31: Τί γὰρ εἶπερ ὀνόματός τινος ἐπὶ βραχὺ μετέσχε δυναστείας ποτέ; ἄρα μετὰ τῶν ἐπιλειμμένων τοῦ κράτους τῆς βασιλείας παρὰ τοῦτο τετάσσεται καὶ νομοθετήσει δεῖσαν καὶ συναθροίσει κοινὰς συνόδους;... πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ. καὶ τί λέγω ταύτην, ἥ καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐκ βασιλείως ἐκεῖνο κῆδος, δουλίας ἦν τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς βασιλευόντων αἰεῖ;

hetos, is equally vitriolic in his attack against her, railing at the impecunious Akindynos for having sold himself to this new Jezebel in exchange for material comforts.⁶⁷ It must be noted, however, that her detractors make no attempt to cast any aspersion on Eulogia's morals or even to hint at an illicit liaison with Akindynos.

Akindynos, on the other hand, cannot find words rapturous enough to describe the wisdom, learning and piety of his royal supporter whom he calls equal to the most noble men in every accomplishment.⁶⁸ Akindynos' successor in the fight against Palamism, the

⁶⁷ See Λόγος τρίτος κατὰ τοῦ κινδυνεύσαντος Ἀκινδύνου, ed. D. Tsames, Ἰωσήφ Καλοθέτου Συγγράμματα, 143, lines 49-53: 'Ἀλλὰ τί ποτ' ἂν σε τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀγάπης καὶ τοῦ δεσμοῦ ἀπαγάγοι; μᾶλλον δὲ τίς ἡδυνήθη ἀπαγαγεῖν σε; γυνὴ κατὰ γῆν εὐγενῆς, βάρος ἀργυρίου, λιπαραὶ τράπεζαι, μαγείρων μαγανεύματα, θρύψις σαρκός, οἶνος ἀνθοσμίας, κατερραστωνευμένος δῖος... *Idem*, Κατὰ Ἰωάννου Καλέκα, ed. Tsames, *op. cit.*, 293, lines 260-261: ...ἡ Ἰεζάβελ δλαιοὺς χερεὶ καταντλοῦσα τὸ ἀργύριον. *Ibid.*, 295, lines 321-22: Οἱ φαργόντες τράπεζαν Ἰεζάβελ παρ' οὐδὲν ἔθεσαν λόγους, νόμους, προφήτας, ἀποστόλους καὶ ὄσους ἄλλους.

⁶⁸ *Letter to Lapithes*, ed. A. Hero (as in note 61 *supra*), letter σθ, lines 85-99: Ὑπεράγαταί σου... καὶ ἡ θεοφιλεστάτη βασίλισσα, ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ Κανικλείου θυγάτηρ, ἡ νύμφη τοῦ βασιλέως, τῆς τῶν Παλαιολόγων γενεᾶς τοῦ δευτέρου, γυνὴ τὴν φύσιν, οὐ γυνὴ τὸν τρόπον, τοῖς ἀνδρῶν γενναιοτάτοις ἐφάμιλλος τὰ κάλλιστα καὶ σπουδαιότατα καὶ θεοφιλέστατα, ἦν ἴσθι φρονουῶσαν ἐπὶ τοῖς σοῖς οὐχ ἥττον ἢ ὁ Κροῖσος ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν ἢ Σεμίραμις τῇ Βαβυλῶνι ἢ αὐτὴ ποτε τῇ ἁλουργίδι, οὐδὲν παραχωροῦσα τοῦ ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας διασπωμένης πάθους, οὐδὲ γὰρ τῆς περὶ ταύτην καὶ τὰ θεῖα δόγματα τῆς ἐκκλησίας συνέσεως... See also Akindynos' 7th *Antirrhetic* against Palamas (*Monac. gr.* 223, fol. 352v): ...ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν βασίλισσαν ἐκείνην ἡ θᾶπτον ἂν τὸ ζῆν προεῖτο καὶ ἡδίων, κἂν εἰ μυρίας μὲν οὖν εἶχε ζωάς, προεῖτ' ἂν ἐτοιμότερα πρότερον ἢ τῆς παρούσης ἀνασχέσθαι καινοτομίας ἥτις δὲ αὕτη τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ θεοσέβειαν οὐκ ἐμὸν ἄρτι λέγειν.

polymath Gregoras, also commends this «true Princess» for her character and for her learning in theology.⁶⁹ It is he who tells us that after the triumph of Palamism, Choumnaina never wavered in her convictions and as a result she suffered persecution. She died, he says, old and ailing but in the odor of sanctity, for her grave was revered as miracle-working by her followers.⁷⁰

Whatever the misfortunes that her role in the Hesychast controversy brought upon her, it was perhaps in this dispute that the scholarly and ambitious daughter of Nikephoros Choumnos finally found an outlet for her talents. Studious, but also energetic and passionate, she was ill-suited for the contemplative life for which she opted when as an unhappy adolescent she came under the influence of the venerable ascetic Theoleptos of Philadelphia. As Prof. Ševčenko first suggested, it was against Theoleptos that Choumnos inveighed in an anonymous pamphlet for encouraging the young widow to dispose of her vast fortune without any regard for the anguish she was causing her parents.⁷¹ A letter of Theoleptos, written shortly before his death, substantiates this view, for it

⁶⁹ *Hist.*, xxix, 21: III, 238, line 2: Εὐλογία ἡ τῷ ὄντι βασίλισσα... See also *ibid.*, 239, lines 11-25: ...βαθεῖαν τε ἐκέκμητο σύνεσιν ἡ γυνή, καὶ σιωπῶσα καὶ φθεγγομένη παραίνεσις ἦν αἰεὶ τοῖς συνοῦσι... ἀπάσης τε πνευματικῆς παιδείας ἀνῶν ἀκριβῆς ...τόν γε μὴν τῆς ἀργίας καιρὸν δίδλων ἱερῶν παρείχεν αἰεὶ ἀναγνώσει, καὶ πείραν ἐντεῦθεν ὑψηλῆς θεωρίας συνῆγε μακράν καὶ ποικίλην, ὁπόση τοῖς θεοῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας δόγμασι καιροῦ καλοῦντος ἐγένετό οἱ σύμμαχος κράτιστος.

⁷⁰ *Hist.*, XXIX, 21: III, 238, lines 2-21. Gregoras implies that Eulogia died in 1353, for after relating the news of her death he proceeds to discuss the events of the following year which happen to be John V's successful entry in Constantinople and the abdication of John Kantakouzenos in 1354. Eulogia, however, was still alive at the end of 1355 when she donated part of the village of Tholos, near Serres in Macedonia, to the monastery of St. John Prodromos on Mt. Menoikion; cf. A. Guillou, *Les Archives de Saint-Jean Prodrome sur le mont Ménécée* (Paris, 1955), no. 46, 142-144. Since this donation was prompted by her «grave illness» (*ibid.*, 144), it would be safe to assume that Eulogia died shortly thereafter, in which case her age at death must have been sixty-five and not «nearly seventy», as Gregoras thought (*Hist.*, XXIX, 22: III, 239, line 37).

⁷¹ See note 9 above.

shows that the wrangling over property matters between Choumnos and his daughter continued for many years and that the metropolitan continued to remind the distressed abbess that she had renounced her family for the sake of Christ.⁷² His dominant role in her life is expressed in her own frank statement that she missed him more than her own father.⁷³

Eulogia's correspondence affords us a rare and intimate glimpse of the monastic life of Byzantine aristocracy. During her long retirement Eulogia remained very conscious of her rank and she invoked imperial protocol not only in dealing with her second director⁷⁴

⁷² Letter 2, *Ottob.* 405, fols. 239r-239v: 'Ο Κύριος ζητούμενος ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ εἶπε· μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες αὐτόν [Matt. 12:49]. εἶπε καὶ αὐτῇ· ὁ πατήρ μου καὶ ἡ μήτηρ μου ἐγκατέλιπόν με, ὁ δὲ Κύριος προσελάβετό με [Ps. (27):10]. ἀδικουμένη καὶ καταφρονουμένη μὴ λυποῦ· οὐ ζημιοῦσαι γὰρ ἀδικουμένη ...οἱ ἀρπάζοντες τὰ σὰ καὶ καταφρονοῦντές σου μᾶλλον ἀδικοῦνται ...οἱ ἀρπάζοντες τὰ σὰ διαρρήσσουσι τοὺς δεσμούς σου καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἐλευθερίαν ὁδοποιοῦσί σε· οἱ καταφρονοῦντές σε ἀκενόδοξον διατηροῦσί σε. *Ibid.*, fol. 241v: Καὶ εἰ πλείονα πόλεμον ἔχεις ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων θλιβομένη, ἀλλ' ἀντιτίθει τοῖς ὀχληροῖς λογισμοῖς... See also the passage from the same letter cited in note 30 above.

⁷³ *Scorialensis*, fol. 237^ar-237^av (Letter 7): 'Εγὼ δὲ ἀπέστειλα τοὺς λόγους τοῦ θαυμαστοῦ ἀνθρώπου ...ἵνα ἴδῃς καὶ τὴν διπλὴν ὀρφανίαν καὶ τὴν ζημίαν ἣν ὑπέστην ἡ τάλαινα στερηθεῖσα δύο τοιούτων πατέρων, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσαντός με καὶ τοῦ διὰ τοῦ μοναχικοῦ ἀναγεννήσαντός με σχήματος ...τούτων τὴν στέρησιν μὴ φέρουσα, καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦ πνευματικοῦ μας πατρός, ὁδυνηρῶς ζῶ.

⁷⁴ Eulogia did not permit her director's companion, a simple-minded monk, to be present at their meetings and gave imperial protocol as one of her reasons; cf. *Scor.*, fol. 251r (Letter 17): ...οὐδὲν ἡγούμην τὸ προσιστάμενον παρεῖναι καὶ τοῦτον ἀκροατὴν τῆς ἡμῶν ὁμιλίας, οὐ διδάσκαλον δεύτερον, οὐδὲ μερίζοντά σου τὴν ἀπλὴν πρὸς ἓνα διάθεσιν· κἂν συνήθειαν βασιλικὴν προβάλλῃ, κἂν ἀπληροφορησίαν, κἂν ὁτιοῦν ἕτερον...

— a poor albeit a respected monk — but she also angered the patriarch with her supercilious manner.⁷⁵ She even claimed that the reason for which she did not leave her convent to attend her relatives' weddings and funerals was her lack of sufficient funds for the upkeep of an equipage proper to her rank.⁷⁶ The normal strictures of monastic discipline did not apply to her, for she remained in close contact with her family and friends, and she continued to

⁷⁵ Wen, at the behest of Eulogia, her director vizited the Patriarch to file a complaint against certain monks, he found him so displeased with the abbess that he urged her to seek the help of a mutual friend in order to appease the Patriarch and sternly advised her to show more humility and submissiveness in dealing with the head of the Church in the future; cf. *Scorial.*, fol. 251v (Letter 18): ὡς δέ μοι δοκεῖ δεῖ ἡμερῶσαι τὸν πατριάρχην πρὸς σεαυτήν, ἀηδῶς γὰρ μοι ἔδοξεν ἔχειν πρὸς σε, καὶ δεῖξαι πρὸς αὐτὸν ταπεινῶσιν ἱκανὴν καὶ λόγους ὑποταγῆς. ὥστε δὲ καὶ ἀζημίως τοῦτο γενέσθαι σοι ...ὁ θαυμάσιος Δεξιὸς δεξιῶς ἀπεργάσσεται, ὃν δεῖ σε μετακαλέσασθαι καὶ τοῦτο αὐτῷ ἐπιμελῶς ἀναθέσθαι, φίλῳ σοι ὄντι ...οὐ γὰρ δίκαιον κρίνω, περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης μάλιστα διαλεγόμενος, μὴ τῆς πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχην πρὸ παντὸς ἄλλου σοι συμβουλεύσαι φροντίσαι. ὁ γὰρ ἂν καὶ εἴποις, πατήρ ἐστι πάντων Χριστιανῶν καὶ δεῖ αὐτὸν, ταπεινοῖς λόγοις ὑπερέχου ὑποχωροῦσιν αὐτῷ καί, οἶμαι, βέλτιον ἀπαλλάξεις κἀνταῦθα διὰ τοιοῦτου τρόπου. As already noted by Laurent, the prelate in question was probably John Kalekas (1334-1347), since Dexiow, a later anti-Palamite, is known to have been a member of that patriarch's entourage; cf. «La direction spirituelle,» 82 and note 1.

⁷⁶ *Scorial.*, fols. 246r-246v (Letter 15): Ἐπεὶ γὰρ συγγένειαν καὶ γνησιότητα ἔχω εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν, ὁποῖαν ἰδοῦ ὄρῳ, εἰ ποσῶς ἐξηρχόμην, ἀνάγκη πᾶσα ἀπέρχεσθαι με καὶ ἐκούσαν καὶ ἄκουσαν εἰς γάμους βασιλικούς καὶ εἰς πένθη καὶ ἐνώσεις αὐθεντικὰς. ἐντεῦθεν χρεῖα καὶ ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀλόγων ἀρκούντων ἀναλόγως, καὶ ποῦ ἔμελλε διαρκεῖν ὁ βίος μου βασιλικὸν λαὸν καὶ οἶκον;

exercise political influence and to administer her property. As Fr. Meyendorff said,⁷⁷ chastity was the monastic vow which royal monks and nuns were required to fulfil; obedience and poverty were not, as a rule, expected of them. Eulogia's example illustrates this statement, but her letters show that despite the relative freedom, the monastic garb must have been a poor substitute for the purple. The reader of these intimate documents suspects that this woman who had once dreamt of reigning over Byzantium did not find fulfilment and peace in the cloister where she spent nearly half a century «slaving,» as she put it, «for the salvation of others.»⁷⁸

Finally, Eulogia's letters, which substantiate her complaint that her education had been neglected, provide a fresh insight into the educational standards of contemporary Byzantine women, in view both of Eulogia's reputation for learning and especially of her birth.⁷⁹ It is undoubtedly significant that Nikephoros Choumnos — himself one of the most prominent and erudite men of his time — did not provide formal literary training for a talented daughter on whom he doted and in whose upbringing he claimed to have taken a special interest.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ See his introduction to the forthcoming edition of Choumnaina's correspondence.

⁷⁸ *Scorial.*, fol. 246v (Letter 15): 'Εγὼ γὰρ διὰ τὴν τῶν ἄλλων ὠφέλειαν κάθημαι ὥδε δεδουλωμένη...

⁷⁹ This particular interest of Choumnaina's letters to the social historian was emphasized by Prof. Ševčenko at the discussion following the presentation of this paper.

⁸⁰ See Πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα βασίλισσαν, ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τῆς χηρείας, ed. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, I, 293-294: 'Εγὼ σε, βασίλισσα μου, φίλτατον παιδίον ἐμόν, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τῶν μητρικῶν ἀπορραγεῖσαν εἶδον ὠδίνων καὶ θρόφου ἡμῖν ἀποτεχθεῖσαν... πάντα εὐθύς ἡγησάμενος ἐθέμην, ζῶν καὶ πνοήν, καὶ φῶς τῶν ἐμῶν ὀμμάτων, καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα καρδίας, καὶ τρυφήν καὶ τέρψιν ψυχῆς, καὶ πᾶν ὅ,τι τοιοῦτον ἦ καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἡδύτερον πλεον καὶ τιμώτερον καὶ κρείττον. καὶ περὶ τὰς σὰς ἀνατροφὰς λίαν ἐπισημένους...

ZUM "BELLUM AVARICUM" DES
GEORGIOS PISIDES
BEMERKUNGEN ZU EINER STUDIE
VON PAUL SPECK¹

JAN-LOUIS VAN DIETEN / AMSTERDAM

Dem 1979 verstorbenen italienischen Byzantinisten Agostino Pertusi verdanken wir eine vorzügliche mit Übersetzung und Kommentar versehene Ausgabe der *Panegirici epici* des Georgios Pisides (Ettal 1959), darunter das bekannte Gedicht «*Bellum Avaricum*» (S. 176-224), das die Befreiung Konstantinopels von der Aarenbelagerung im J. 626 feiert. Die nachfolgenden Bemerkungen befassen sich mit einem Büchlein zum gleichen Gedicht, das «bei aller Divergenz der Interpretation» dem Andenken Pertusi gewidmet ist, und werden weitgehend diese divergierende Interpretation anfechten.

Sp. kommentiert nicht das ganze Gedicht, sondern ausgewählte Verse, namentlich den Titel und die Verse 34-48, 49-66, 121-124, 374-379, 403-501, 502-508. Die Kommentierung geschieht selbstverständlich unter Zuhilfenahme weiterer Verse, die dann ebenfalls eingehender interpretiert werden, wie etwa zum Titel die

¹ Speck, Paul: Zufälliges zum *Bellum Avaricum* des Georgios Pisides in Zusammenarbeit mit Studenten des Münchener Instituts. München: Institut für Byzantinistik, Neugriechische Philologie und Byzantinische Kunstgeschichte der Universität 1980. (*Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia*, 24).

Verse 307-310 und 535-541.

Der eigentliche Zweck des Gedichts wäre, «ein Panegyrikos auf den Patriarchen Sergios (610-638) zu sein» (so S. 15 u. 19). Dem widerspricht Pisides selbst in V. 1/9, 14/5. Das Gedicht wird zwar dem Patriarchen gewidmet, und dessen Lob kommt deshalb selbstverständlich nicht zu kurz, aber der eigentliche Zweck ist, die im Avarenkrieg erlebten Wunder (der Gottesmutter) zu besingen, damit sie nicht vergessen werden. Das genau tut auch das Gedicht, zu dem Patriarch Sergios vielleicht (als «Pflanzer geistgesäter Worte», V. 12; vgl. 162-164) Pisides anregte. «Held» des Gedichts ist denn auch nicht, wie es in Anm. 4 heisst, Sergios, sondern die Theotokos der Blachernenkirche. Richtig widerspricht Sp. sich selbst S. 48, wo er das Lob des Sergios als eingebettet in das der Gottesmutter, und S. 53, wo er die «Aristie der Maria in ihrem Blachernenviertel» als Zentralthema des Pisides bezeichnet.

Das Gedicht ist in direkter Anrede an den Patriarchen Sergios verfasst (s. Anm. 3, wo 223 in 224-227 zu korrigieren ist). Trotzdem wird auch Kaiser Herakleios einmal unmittelbar angesprochen, V. 307-310. Der Dichter verspricht ihm, in ruhigeren Zeiten seine Mühen eigens zu besingen. Sp. versucht, diese Verse als Interpolation bzw. als Argument für eine späte Datierung des ganzen Gedichts zu interpretieren, weil ihm Nissens Ansicht einer Anrede an den fernen Kaiser «weniger wahrscheinlich scheint» (S. 15). Nichtsdestoweniger nimmt Sp. später die Rückkehr des Herakleios von seinem Persienfeldzug als t.a.q. des Gedichts an (S. 19), ohne sich konsequent darauf festzulegen, dass dann die Verse 307-310 eine spätere Erweiterung sein müssten. Eine Apostrophe an einen Abwesenden ist aber in der byzantinischen Rhetorik — und Rhetoren sind auch die byzantinischen Dichter — nichts Aussergewöhnliches; bei Pisides ergibt sich diese Apostrophe fast zwangsläufig aus der lobenden Erwähnung der Sorgen, die der Kaiser aus der Ferne der bedrohten Stadt widmete. Neben dem Patriarchen darf und wird der Kaiser nicht zurückstehen. Seine Mühen werden in grösserem Rahmen besungen werden, sobald die Zeit dazu günstig ist. Was diesen Zeitpunkt betrifft, «scheint» es Sp. «unwahrscheinlich», dass Pisides das obengenannte Versprechen geben konnte, solange der Ausgang des Perserkrieges unsicher war

(Anm. 13). Hier wird vom Dichter verlangt, dass er aus reinem Pessimismus, nämlich weil der Sieg noch unsicher sei, den Kaiser ausgeklammert oder mit seinem Lobgedicht auf die Theotokos und den Patriarchen gewartet hätte, bis auch die Zeit für ein Lob des Kaisers reif sei. Das ist nicht nur zuviel verlangt, sondern für soviel Pessimismus hatte Pisides nach dem Sieg des Kaiserbruders Theodoros über das persische Heer Shahins (ca. Juni 626) und dem Sieg über Avaren und Perser vor Konstantinopel (Aug. 626) auch keinen Anlass. Vor dem weiter unten zu erwähnenden Argument für eine frühere Datierung des Gedichts kann Specks Interpretation der Verse 307-310 also nicht bestehen.

Wenig fruchtbare Überlegungen stellt Sp. auch zu den Versen 535-541 an, wo er die Bezeichnung des jungen Mitkaisers Herakleios-Konstantinos als «dein Kind» «überraschend» findet (S. 16). Diese Bezeichnung ist nur «protokollgerecht» (so richtig S. 18); der irdische Sieger im Bellum Avaricum ist der in der Stadt anwesende junge Kaiser. Bei σὸν τέκνον und νεώτερον κράτος an Herakleios zu denken, ist abwegig, auch wenn zuvor der Kaiser θάλλων θείοις κλάδοις eine Pflanzung des Patriarchen genannt wird (V. 532). Die Pflanzung ist nicht «der Kaiser *mit* seinen Nachkommen» (S. 16), sondern der Kaiser *in* seinen Kindern (so richtig in Anm. 17), weil einerseits seine zweite Ehe von Sergios eingesegnet wurde, und andererseits seine Kinder, insbesondere der Thronfolger Herakleios-Konstantinos dessen speziellem Schutz anvertraut waren. (Durch diese Interpretation wird Anm. 19 überflüssig).

Zu Unrecht wird es (S. 18) «abwegig» genannt, in V. 539-541 eine Anspielung auf die geplante Ehe des Herakleios-Konstantinos mit Gregoria, der Tochter des Patrikios Niketas zu sehen. Es heisst darin: «Nike (Sieg) erscheine; jetzt kannst du diesen Bräutigam nehmen, dem du als Brautgabe schon die Abschlachtung der Barbaren geschenkt hast». Es ist unnötig, hier für eine solche Anspielung einen schon feststehenden Hochzeitstermin zu verlangen (S. 17). Herakleios-Konstantinos war mit der Niketastochter seit kurz nach seiner Geburt (612) verlobt (613). Die Aufforderung an Nike kann als Reifezeugnis für den erfolgreichen jungen Mitkaiser und als kleine Schmeichelei des Brautvaters gemeint sein. Beweisen lässt sich eine solche Interpretation natürlich nicht, aber abwegig ist sie keinesfalls.

Mit der Bezeichnung des Herakleios-Konstantinos als τὸν σὸν τέκνον in einer Anrede an Patriarch Sergios verbindet Sp. die Frage nach der Stellung des letzteren während der Abwesenheit des Herakleios (S. 16 f.). Klarheit kommt dabei nicht zustande. Einerseits wird festgestellt, dass Sergios protokollarisch vor dem Verwalter der Staatsgeschäfte Bonos rangierte, andererseits dass Sergios in seiner Stellung (der des Betreuers des Herakleios-Konstantinos) wohl durch Herakleios «bestärkt» wurde, aber ohne protokollarische Institutionalisierung. In der Nachricht des Theophanes (S. 303, 3-6), dass Herakleios für die Zeit seiner Abwesenheit Herakleios-Konstantinos zusammen mit Sergios in Konstantinopel zurückliess, um mit Bonos zusammen die Staatsgeschäfte zu führen, interpretiert Sp. die Nennung des Sergios als spätere Deutung seines Einsatzes während der Avarenbelagerung. Und im Bericht des Nikephoros Patriarches, dass Herakleios seine Kinder dem Patriarchen, den Archonten und dem Rest des Volkes anvertraute, dem Patrikios Bonos aber die Verwaltung übertrug, habe die Nennung des Sergios nur moralische, keine konstitutionelle Bedeutung (Anm. 23). Demnach hätte Sergios weder die Stellung eines Mitregenten, noch sonstwie eine offizielle Stellung innegehabt. Trotzdem soll seine nicht identifizierte Position eine persönliche Verantwortung für den jungen Mitkaiser beinhaltet haben, die ihm die zweite Stelle im Protokoll sicherte (S. 17). Aufgrund dieser undefinierbaren Stellung sei er auch irgendwie «Mitverfasser» des offiziellen Berichts über die Avarenbelagerung, der im Namen des Kaisersohnes an Herakleios geschickt worden wäre und der hinter der Darstellung der Ereignisse im Chronikon Paschale (C.P.) vermutet wird (Anm. 4). Ich halte solche unklaren Verhältnisse für wenig wahrscheinlich und bin der Meinung, dass die Quellen mehr hergeben. Laut Nikeph. Patr. S. 15, 13-17 legte Herakleios, ehe er Konstantinopel verliess, die Verantwortung für seine Kinder in die Hände des Patriarchen, der Archonten und des übrigen Volkes (worunter man mit Sp. Anm. 23 natürlich die üblichen Vertreter des Volkes zu verstehen hat), die Verwaltung der Staatsgeschäfte aber in die Hände des Bonos. Demnach — und die Angaben der übrigen Quellen bestätigen das — vertrat das erstgenannte Kollegium die höchste Macht, nämlich den Vater des protokollarisch regierenden minderjährigen Herakleios-

Konstantinos, während Bonos für die Abwicklung der laufenden Regierungsangelegenheiten und insbesondere für die Verteidigung der Stadt zuständig war. Nicht nur Theodoros Synkellos in seiner Predigt über die Avarenbelagerung S. 306, 20-22 lässt erkennen, dass besonders wichtige Entscheidungen vom genannten Kollegium getroffen wurden, sondern auch das C.P.S. 718, 14 bezeugt das. In diesem Kollegium, dem natürlich auch Bonos als erster der Archonten angehörte, nahm Sergios laut Darstellung der Quellen, besonders des Theodoros Synkellos, den ersten Platz ein, und deshalb kam er im Protokoll selbstverständlich unmittelbar nach Herakleios-Konstantinos. (Ich bleibe also, gegen Anm. 27, bei der «Verzeichnung» der Stellung des Sergios in meiner Arbeit, *Gesch. der Patr. Sergios I.* — Joh. VI., und verwechsle dort S. 16 Anm. 56 keineswegs Zeremoniell und faktische Herrschaft, wie aus Anm. 60 ebd., wohin verwiesen wird, klar hervorgeht. Die Entsendung von Unterhändlern am 2. August 626 war als protokollarischer Vorgang ein Akt des Herakleios-Konstantinos, als Entscheidung eine Tat der politisch verantwortlichen Personen, Sergios, Bonos, Senatsvertreter).

Ziemlich inkonsequent ist es, wenn Sp. in Sergios den «Mitverfasser» eines offiziellen Berichts über die Belagerung sehen will, der an den im Feld stehenden Herakleios geschickt worden wäre und im C.P. seine Spuren hinterlassen hätte. Wenn Bonos der eigentliche und alleinig verantwortliche Vertreter des Kaisers in der Stadt gewesen wäre, hätte er und niemand anders für den jungen Mitkaiser den Bericht schreiben müssen. Ob man aber hinter der Darstellung des C.P. ein solches Dokument als Quelle annehmen kam, ist zweifelhaft. In einem offiziellen Bericht würde man z.B. von der genannten Gesandtschaft vom 2. August eine protokollgerechtere Darstellung erwarten, als sie das C.P. 721, 5-6 bietet. Weiter ist zur Darstellung des C.P. zu bemerken, dass auch ein offizieller Berichterstatter im J. 626 keinen Grund hatte, die bedeutende Rolle des Patriarchen Sergios völlig totzuschweigen, wie das im C.P. geschieht, nicht einmal Sergios selbst, wenn er als «Staatsratsvorsitzender» einen solchen Bericht an den Kaiser verfasst hätte. Auch dass ein offizieller Bericht sich auf das Weltliche beschränken und das Religiöse ausklammern musste, scheint mir

unbyzantinisch gedacht. So gibt es (gegen Anm. 4) wohl doch Anlass, das Totschweigen des Sergios und damit der religiösen Komponente der Stadtverteidigung im C.P. einem anti-monotheistischen Redaktor zuzuschreiben.

Abschliessend sei zum Titelkommentar noch notiert, dass es wenig Sinn hat, wie es in Anm. 27 geschieht, αὐοῦ in V. 534 für auf Gott beziehbar zu halten. Dass Gott immer siegen möge, so dass der Dichter davon singen kann (V. 533), ist ein Wunsch, den man einem Byzantiner nicht in den Mund legen kann. Gott siegt immer. Mit αὐτοῦ kann also nur Herakleios gemeint sein.

Anlässlich der Verse 49-66 über die inneren und äusseren Probleme des Reiches nach dem Sturz des Phokas (602-610) präsentiert Sp. Ansätze seines zu erwartenden Versuchs einer (Teil)—Rehabilitation dieses Kaisers (s. Anm. 65 u. Paul Speck, Konstantin VI., S. 769), die kaum Gelingen versprechen, aber das sei der Zukunft überlassen. Hier sei nur auf eine in diesem Zusammenhang in Anm. 60 vorgelegte Fehlinterpretation der Verse 90-97 der Herakleias 11 des Pisides hingewiesen. Sp. möchte aus V. 90-92 schliessen, dass Herakleios sogar versucht hätte, die Avaren als Kampfgenossen gegen die Perser zu gewinnen. Der einzige Grund für diese Ansicht scheint mir eine Fehlübersetzung, die Sp. von Pertusi übernommen haben dürfte (volendo [Herakleios] talvolta sferrare un attacco lanciando Caridi [gli Avari] contro la Gorgone [i Persiani]). Zur Widerlegung hier zuerst der griechische Text der Verse 90-97 und dann eine richtige Übersetzung. Καὶ πολλάκις τὸ τόξον ἐντεῖναι θέλων / βαλεῖν τε τὴν Χάρυβδιν, εἰς τὴν Γοργόνα, / τὴν πετροποιὸν τῶν θεατῶν εἰκόνα, / στραφεῖς ἐπέσχες τὴν βολὴν ἡπειγμένην· / καὶ δὴ κατ' αὐτῆς ἀντιβάλλοντας βέλος / ἀνθεῖλκον ὑμᾶς οἱ φυλάρπαγες λύκοι· / χρόνω δὲ μικρῷ συγκροτῶν ἐκατέρεις / μίαν κατ' αὐτῶν τριπλοκίνδυνον μάχην. (Das Komma nach Χάρυβδιν habe ich eingefügt; anstelle von ἀντιβάλλοντας behält Sp. gegen Pertusi u.a. das überlieferte ἀντιβάλλοντες bei). Ich übersetze: «Oft wolltest Du den Bogen spannen und die Charybdis (die Avaren) treffen, aber Dich umdrehend zur Gorgo (den Persern), diesem Bild, das den, der es anschaut, versteinert, hast Du den Pfeil, der schon unter Druck stand, zurückgehalten; denn während Du auf sie den Pfeil richtetest, zogen Dich die raub-

gierigen Wölfe (die Slaven) in andere Richtung.» Obwohl diese Übersetzung für sich spricht, noch die folgenden Bemerkungen: Für *lanciare contra* wäre zumindest *βαλεῖν ἐπί* zu erwarten; *βαλεῖν πρὸς* würde eher «schmettern gegen» (zerschmettern auf) bedeuten. Sp. übersetzt *ἐπέσχες* kaum zulässig mit «du hast selbst das Geschoss ausgehalten»; das hiesse doch wohl eher *ἀνέσχες*. Mit *ἀνθεῖλχον* weiss Sp. nicht gut Rat; er nennt es «ungeklärt» und denkt an Rückendeckung für Byzanz seitens der Slaven; es steht aber klar parallel zu *στραφεῖς* in V. 93. Schliesslich bestätigt V. 97, dass Herakleios allein den Kampf gegen drei gefährliche Feinde bewältigt hat. Vergebliche Versuche, den einen Feind gegen den anderen auszuspielen, soll man in einem panegyrischen Gedicht nicht suchen.

Von den Versen, die den versuchten Überfall des Avarenkhans auf den ihm zu Friedensverhandlungen entgegenreitenden Herakleios behandeln, bespricht Sp. speziell V. 121-124. Den genannten Versuch bezeichnet er vorzugsweise als den Verrat, den Vorfall usw. von 617 oder einfach als 617, was kaum empfehlenswert ist, solange die Argumente für die Datierung des Vorfalls auf 623 gleich stark sind (s. Stratos, *Byzantium in the seventh century I*, 361-365) und auch das Jahr 619 noch Anhänger hat. Man vermeidet dann auch irreführende Angaben wie «Er (Vasilievskij) übersieht die Quellen, die den 5. Juni in das Jahr 617 legen» (Anm. 194). Das tut keine Quelle; der überlieferte Text des C.P. legt den 5. Juni in das Jahr 623 und das Typikon der Grossen Kirche von Konstantinopel nennt den 5. Juni ohne Jahr. Pertusi hat nun die Frage aufgeworfen, ob mit der Sünde, die in V. 122 als eigentliche Ursache des genannten Überfalls bezeichnet wird, eine konkrete Sünde gemeint sei, etwa die Ehe des Herakleios mit seiner Nichte Martina. Mit Sp. halte ich diesen Gedanken für abwegig. Solche Kritik darf man in einem Gedicht, das auch für die Ohren des Kaisers bestimmt ist, wie das Lob auf ihn zeigt, nicht erwarten; und erst recht nicht in einem Gedicht, das Sergios gewidmet ist, der schliesslich die Ehe eingesegnet hatte. Wenn aber Sp. dazu meint (Anm. 75), der Vergleich der Situation Konstantinopels zu diesem Zeitpunkt mit der Jerusalems unter Achaz bei Theodoros Synkellos habe nichts mit Kritik an Herakleios zu tun, der Kirchenschätze für

den Krieg verwendete, so wie Achaz einst die Tempelschätze wegnahm, ist das nur insofern richtig, als Theodoros Synkellos selbst keine solche Kritik äussern will, aber wenn er dabei den Unterschied in der Frömmigkeit zwischen Herakleios und Achaz hervorhebt, kann das sehr wohl als Antwort auf eine solche Kritik gemeint sein. Und wenn Sp. dann überhaupt kirchliche Kritik an der Ehe des Kaisers mit Martina in Frage stellt, sind die Gründe dafür sehr schwach. Die Ehe war unkanonisch, und es war die Pflicht des Patriarchen, den Kaiser darauf hinzuweisen. Warum sollte Sergios, kein schwacher Patriarch, nicht getan haben, was auch andere Patriarchen wagten. Für abwegig halte ich darum die Ansicht, dass der kritische Bericht bei Nikeph. Patr. über den Protest der «Circus Factions» und des Patriarchen gegen diese Ehe eine Erfindung aus der Zeit Konstans II. sei, etwa weil die Grünen sich bei diesem Kaiser einschmeicheln wollten und die Kirche den «Häretiker» Sergios aufwerten zu müssen glaubte. Unter Konstans II. galt Sergios überhaupt nicht als Häretiker. Und wenn Nikephoros anschliessend mitteilt, dass um die gleiche Zeit die Kostbarkeiten der Kirche verkauft wurden, um die Tribute an die Barbaren zahlen zu können, stellt er das nicht als «die Rache des Herakleios an die Kirche» (S. 84) dar, sondern höchstens als eine weitere Sünde des Herakleios.

Sp. benutzt die Gelegenheit, gleich eine weitere Nachricht des Nikeph. Patr. in Frage zu stellen, nämlich die, dass Sergios Herakleios davon abhielt, seine Residenz (Operationsbasis?) nach Afrika (Karthago) zu verlegen (S. 84 f.). Er hat aber dieser Nachricht nichts weiter gegenüberzustellen als ein «man hat den Eindruck» und «es scheint». Reine Vermutung ist es auch, wenn Sp. schreibt, dass hier Herakleios' Verhalten bei Nikephoros in Feigheit umgedeutet und mit Habgier angereichert wird (weil er Geld vorausschickte). Bevor man von Umdeutung sprechen kann, muss man nachweisen, dass das von Nikephoros genannte Motiv nicht das wahre gewesen sein kann, und wenn man zumindest das Faktum, dass Herakleios nach Afrika gehen wollte, akzeptiert, was ist dann selbstverständlicher, als dass er auch Geld dorthin schickte, wie Nikephoros berichtet, so dass jeder vernünftige Grund fehlt, hier von Anreicherung mit Habgier zu sprechen.

Zurück zum *Bellum Avaricum*. Im Kommentar zu V. 121-124 (S. 24-26) versucht Sp. auch noch, gegen Pertusi zu zeigen, dass Pisides von Theodoros Synkellos abhängig ist und nicht umgekehrt. Der langen Rede kurzer Sinn ist, dass Pisides («irrtümlich? absichtlich?») übersah, dass Synkellos die Sünden als Hauptgrund für die Belagerung von 626 voranstellte und darum diese Aussage im Rückgriff auf die Vorgeschichte von «617» auf die Situation jenes Jahres übertrug. Zu Pertusis Hinweis auf den Vergleich von Avarern und Persern mit Skylla und Charybdis in *Bellum Avaricum* 204-206, den Theodoros Synkellos S. 304,18 ff. mit der Bemerkung «ein Dichter würde sagen» übernommen habe, meint Sp. (S. 18), ein solcher Vergleich liege ziemlich nahe. Nun der Hinweis auf die Sünden zur Erklärung eines Unglücks, sei es das von «617», sei es das von 626, lag für jeden Byzantiner mehr denn ziemlich nahe; dafür brauchte keiner ein konkretes Vorbild. Für die Priorität des Pisides gelten also auch weiterhin als stärkstes Argument die Verse 165-168 (vgl. Pertusi S. 215), wo Pisides sagt, dass er den rezenten Kampf erörtern will, aber dabei von der Angst behindert wird, die ihm noch in den Knochen steckt. Nach mehr als einem Jahr ist es auch für einen Dichter kaum noch angemessen so zu übertreiben. (Als Ort des Vortrags der Predigt des Theodoros Synkellos schlägt Sp. in Anm. 42 übrigens die Laurentioskirche vor, wo man vor der Feier des Tages Station machen würde; dazu wird auf Anm. 187 verwiesen, wo es aber um die Station vor dem Fest vom 2. Juli geht!).

Im Kommentar zu V. 403-501 (S. 30 ff.) wird die Mitteilung des Pisides, dass die Avarern das Blachernenviertel einnahmen, dahingehend interpretiert, dass damit nur der äussere Teil dieses Viertels gemeint sein kann. Insbesondere möchte Sp. gegen Barisić, Pertusi und Stratos nachweisen, dass die Avarern nicht in die Muttergotteskirche der Blachernen eindrangen. Dem steht nun eine Nachricht im C.P. entgegen, in der es heisst (S. 725, 18-20), dass die Feinde, deren Nachhut zwei andere Kirchen im Blachernenviertel niederbrannte, zwar auch in die Kirche der Theotokos eingedrungen seien, aber dort keinen Schaden anrichten konnten, weil Gott es nicht wollte. Sp. meint nun zwischen Pisides und dem C.P. einen

Widerspruch feststellen zu können, da bei Pisides die Avaren gleich am Anfang sich in den Plätzen der Gottesmutter verschanzen, im C.P. aber «nur eine letzte Handlung vor dem Abzug gemeint ist». Letzteres nun behauptet das C.P. gerade nicht. Nach der Mitteilung, dass die Nachhut zwei Kirchen zerstörte, hält der Autor es für nötig, der Frage zuvorzukommen, was mit der wichtigsten Kirche dort geschah. In der Antwort, die er darauf gibt, wechselt er auffallend das Subjekt; anstelle der Nachhut treten «die Feinde» als Subjekt auf; dadurch wird die Aussage auf die ganze Kampfzeit bezogen. Sp. notiert zwar den Subjektwechsel (Anm. 204), sieht darin aber ein Anzeicheno dass hier zwei getrennte Notizen zusammengeflickt wurden, eine Erklärung, die erst in Frage käme, wenn es keine einfachere gäbe. Übrigens setzt die Niederbrennung der zwei im C.P. namentlich genannten Kirchen nicht unbedingt voraus, dass die Avaren im Blachernenviertel im engeren Sinn, d.h. im (später) von der Herakleiosmauer umschlossenen Teil waren, wo sich die bekannte Blachernenkirche der Theotokos befand. Die beiden Kirchen waren nämlich die des Kosmas und Damian, das berühmte Kosmidion, das bekanntlich etwa 1 km ausserhalb der Stadtmauern blieb, und die des hl. Nikolaos, die nördlich der Muttergotteskirche lag (s. dazu unten). Aus dem C.P. darf man also wohl auch schliessen, dass die Nachhut der Avaren ihre zerstörerische Rache nicht mehr auf die Theotokoskirche ausdehnte.

Ein wichtigeres Argument gegen die Bestätigung des Pisides durch das C.P. glaubt Sp. dadurch zu finden, dass er den Bericht über die Avarenbelagerung im C.P. S. 725,5 enden lässt und die danach folgenden Mitteilungen (S. 725, 6-726,3) als Einzelnotizen betrachtet, die zum Avarenüberfall von «617» gehören und hier versehentlich auf 626 bezogen werden. Dazu stellt er dann Überlegungen an, wie man diese Notizen besser auf «617» als auf 626 beziehen kann. Es würde zu weit führen, hier jedes einzelne «es scheint», «es ist nicht auszuschliessen», «es mag sein», «es ist nicht völlig ohne Bedenken», «es scheint nicht abwegig zu vermuten» zu erörtern. Hier nur die folgenden Bemerkungen: Von einem unlogischen Anschluss (Anm. 205) kann zu C.P. 725, 5/6 keine Rede sein. Auch wenn man annimmt, dass der aus unbekannter Quelle ge-

schöpfte Bericht über den militärischen Verlauf der Belagerung im C.P.S. 725,5 endet, schliessen sich die zusätzlichen Versuche, den eiligen Abzug der Avaren zu erklären (725, 6-9; 9-11; 11-15) logisch an. Auch ist es (gegen Anm. 115) wenig rätselhaft, worauf sich τὸ γεγονὸς 725,6 bezieht; natürlich auf das grosse Geschehen, das im vorausgehenden Text (einschliesslich der Lücke S. 724,9) ausführlich geschildert wurde: die Niederlage der slavischen «Seemacht». (Das entspricht übrigens genau Nikeph. Patr. S. 18, 23-24). Nach den genannten Deutungen des Abzugs folgen dann ebenfalls nicht unlogisch Angaben über die Zerstörungen durch die Nachhut der Avaren. Es ist aber im übrigen keineswegs klar, dass der «eigentliche» Bericht im C.P. 725,5 endet. Vielmehr könnten nur die Deutungen 725, 6-9 und 9-11 in diesen Bericht eingeschoben sein. S. 725, 11 ἐδῆλωσε usw. würde ausgezeichnet an 725,5 anschliessen. Schliesslich dürfte in einem offiziellen Bericht, wie Sp. ihn hier als Quelle vermutet, zumindest die Notiz über die Ankunft des Entsatzheeres unter Kommando des Kaiserbruders Theodoros (S. 726, 4-10) nicht gefehlt haben und müsste also auch noch aus diesem mutmasslichen Dokument stammen. Das einzige wirkliche Problem im ganzen Bericht S. 725, 6-726,10 bildet in der genannten abschliessenden Nachricht S. 726,4-10, die unbestreitbar und von Sp. unbestritten zu 626 gehört, das Fehlen des Subjekts (der Khagan) S. 726,4. Mehr als einen kleinen Abschreibefehler braucht man aber zur Lösung dieses Problems nicht zu bemühen.

Die starken Unterschiede zwischen der Kirchenzerstörung in «617» und 626 werden von Sp. bagatellisiert. Eine der Kirchen ist in 626 eine andere und liegt an ganz anderer Stelle; Plünderung steht gegenüber Niederbrennung; die Zeitbestimmungen sind ganz verschieden: im ersten Fall Sonnabend, der erste und einzige Tag des Angriffs, in 626 Freitag, der Tag des Abzugs nach zehntägiger Belagerung, vor der siebten Stunde (ca. 4 Uhr). Wenn man solche Unterschiede nicht wirklich ernst nimmt (s.S. 33), kann man alles wegräsonnieren. Insbesondere zum unterschiedlichen Wochentag meint Sp., dies sei kein Beweis, da für «617» nicht feststehe, wie lange die Avaren blieben, und der Wochentag deshalb im C.P. an den Bericht von 626 angepasst sein könnte. «Mehrere Tage scheinen (für «617») sicher zu sein», heisst es dazu in Anm. 122.

Das einzige Argument für diese scheinbare Sicherheit liefert die umstrittene Predigt des «Theodoros Synkellos» auf die depositio vestis BMV in der Blachernenkirche (BHG 1058). Mit Recht beanstandet Sp. (Anm. 172), dass ich (Gesch. der Patr., wie oben, S. 16-21) diese Predigt auf 626 bezogen habe. Inzwischen ist aber, was Sp. nicht mehr rechtzeitig bekannt geworden ist, der Bezug auf «617» in Frage gestellt worden. J. Worthley, *The Oration of Theodore Syncellus (BHG 1058) and the Siege of 860*, in *Byzantine Studies/Études byzantines* 4 (1977) 111-126, ist wieder für den Bezug auf 860 eingetreten. Eine Stellungnahme dazu ist hier also unvermeidlich. Worthley kann tatsächlich einige ansprechende Argumente für 860 vorbringen, die aber doch letzten Endes nicht überzeugen können. Die Ansicht Mango's (*Homilies of Photius*, S. 77), dass die vierte Homilie des Photios ex silentio beweise, dass der Kaiser (Michael III.) entgegen der Darstellung des Symeon Logothetes erst nach dem Abzug der Russen in die Stadt zurückkehrte, muss (obwohl W. dazu schweigt) nicht unbedingt richtig sein, so dass die in Theodoros' Homilie bezeugte Anwesenheit des Kaisers zutreffen könnte. Nichts aber entspricht im J. 860 der eindeutigen Aussage Theodors, dass der heranrückende Barbarenherrscher mit dem Kaiser persönlich zusammentreffen wollte, um einen Friedensvertrag zu schliessen. (Auch dazu schweigt W.!). Weiter kann man zwar trotz der nach 626 gebauten Verstärkungen eine Gefährdung des Blachernenviertels durch die Russen in 860 nicht ausschliessen, so dass man eine Bergung des Kleides der Gottesmutter für nötig gehalten haben könnte. Es ist aber wenig wahrscheinlich, dass die in der Homilie Theodors beschriebene spektakuläre Bergung in den Homilien des Photios keine Spuren hinterlassen hätte; lag sie doch — wenn sie 860 stattgefunden haben soll — nur wenige Tage vor der rettenden Prozession mit der Reliquie. Auch ist es unwahrscheinlich, dass ein Eindringen der Russen in das voll zur Stadt gehörende Blachernenviertel in der byzantinischen Chronistik kein Echo gefunden hätte. Gewiss scheint es — sofern die Quellen uns nicht im Stich lassen — um das Kleid der Gottesmutter zwischen der Auffindung im 4. Jh. und der Prozession in 860, wenn man von Theodors chronologisch umstrittener Homilie und einigen zweifelhaften Erwähnungen absieht, still zu

sein. Dem steht aber gegenüber, dass Photios in seiner vierten Homilie die Reliquie überhaupt nicht als etwas Neues präsentiert, zu der man nun zum ersten Mal Zuflucht genommen hätte (s. Mango S. 102 f., 109). Und schliesslich, nach der von Photios bezeugten rettenden Prozession mit der Reliquie, konnte ein Prediger «In depositionem» dieser Reliquie es sich nicht leisten, diese Rolle totzuschweigen, was aber der Fall wäre, wenn man die Homilie auf 860 bezieht. W. fragt sich auch (S. 118), warum das Kleid der Gottesmutter, wenn es schon 619 die Stadt gerettet hätte, 626 nicht in der Prozession über die Mauer mitgetragen wurde. (W. folgt in der Datierung des Avarenüberfalls Wenger, L'assomption; 619 wurde übrigens schon von Vasilievskij vertreten, dem W. die Datierung auf 626 zuschreibt; den Fehler habe ich gemacht). Der Grund dürfte sein, dass man der Reliquie überhaupt nie die Rettung beim Avarenüberfall zugeschrieben hat. Dies wird zwar, u.a. auch von Sp., als quasi selbstverständlich angenommen, aber in der Homilie «In depositionem» geschieht dies nicht. Ihre schützende Funktion wird darin erst im Ansatz erwähnt (mehr dazu unten). Und hätte man damals gleich die Rettung nicht ganz allgemein der Gottesmutter, sondern speziell der neuentdeckten Reliquie zugeschrieben, wäre es sonderbar, dass keine historische Quelle etwas davon weiss.

Zurück zu unserem Ausgangspunkt. Die Predigt des Theodoros Synkellos «In depositionem» kann also als Zeuge für den Avarenüberfall zugelassen werden. Tatsächlich nun heisst es darin, dass Kaiser und Patriarch angesichts der (avarischen) Drohung Tag und Nacht in der sogenannten Jerusalem-Kirche beteten (S. 594,4 ff.). Die Stelle ist aber aufgrund von C.P. 712, 12 ff. auf die Zeit vor d. 5. Juni zu beziehen, denn auch die Ereignisse vom Überfall auf den Kaiser bis einschliesslich der Plünderung zweier Kirchen im Blachernenviertel spielten sich zwischen der 4. Stunde und dem späten Abend dieses Tages ab (C.P. 712,21 u. 713,5-6). Aus der Kombination der Berichte im C.P., bei Nikeph. Patr. 12,29 ff. und Theophanes 301 f. wird der Ablauf klar. Der Avarenkhagan rückte mit einer unzähligen Menge in Thrakien ein. Der Kaiser schickte ihm Gesandte entgegen. Inzwischen nimmt man in Konstantinopel seine Zuflucht zum Gebet. Die Gesandten können den Khagan anscheinend beschwichtigen. Er will mit dem Kaiser persönlich in

Herakleia (in Thrakien) Frieden schliessen. Der Kaiser zieht ihm entgegen (gewiss nicht zum Jagen, wie Worthley S. 118 meint) und trifft einige Tage vor dem 5. Juni in Selymbria ein. Am Sonntag dem 5. Juni versucht dann der Khagan verräterisch, Herakleios zu umzingeln. Der kann aber noch rechtzeitig in die Stadt flüchten. Die Leute des Khagans machen darauf Station im Hebdomon und plündern von dort aus das Gebiet ausserhalb der Stadtmauern. Spätabends ist der ganze Spuck offenbar vorbei; am 6. Juni morgens müssen die Avaren schon wieder verschwunden gewesen sein, da sonst das Gedächtnis der Befreiung aus dieser Gefahr nicht am 5. (s. Sp. S. 42), sondern an einem späteren Tag gefeiert worden wäre. Diesem Ablauf trägt Sp. nicht gebührend Rechnung. So spricht er von einer «Überraschungsniederlage» der Byzantiner (S. 24), obwohl gar keine Schlacht stattfand, und von der «Belagerung» von 617 (S. 59), die es offenbar nicht gegeben hat. Zum ersten Epigramm des Pisides auf die Blachernenkirche (A.P. I 120) (korrigiere in der letzten Zeile ἀνακαμπεῖς in ἀκαμπεῖς) meint Sp., dass es an sich auch auf «617» bezogen werden könnte (S. 54). In diesem Epigramm ist aber eindeutig von einem Angriff auf die Stadt die Rede (V. 9), die für «617» nicht überliefert ist und auch nicht angenommen werden kann, da der Khagan selbst ausserhalb der Langen Mauer blieb (C.P. 713, 2-3). Ausserdem ist für «617» nirgends, wie hier V. 10, von einer Rolle der Theotokos als Strategos die Rede.

Zu den «Einzelnotizen» im C.P. 725,6-726,3 ist nun noch folgendes zu sagen.

Zu 725, 6-8: Nichts in den Berichten des C.P., des Nikeph. Patr. und des Theoph. weist darauf hin, dass am Überfall von «617» Slaven beteiligt waren, die etwas gesehen hätten, das sie zur Flucht veranlasste, was wiederum den Khagan zum Abzug bewogen hätte. Im Gegenteil, in Stadtnähe kann in der kurzen Zeitspanne des eigentlichen Überfalls nur die avarische Reiterei gekommen sein. Ausserdem zogen die Avaren «617» offenbar nicht gezwungen, sondern ausgiebig plündernd ab.

Zu 725,9-11: Der Khagan sah «auf der Mauer» die Muttergottes. Das passt nicht zu «617» als der Khagan persönlich ausserhalb der Langen Mauer (s. ob.), d.h. zumindest 40km von der Stadt entfernt blieb.

Zu 725,11-15: Der Khagan hatte «617» offenbar keine Belagerung Konstantinopels vor; sonst wäre er nicht persönlich ausserhalb der Langen Mauer geblieben. Die Tatsache, dass es ihm nicht gelungen war, Herakleios gefangenzunehmen, kann natürlich kein Grund gewesen sein, eine geplante und vorbereitete Belagerung aufzugeben. Auch ist aus der anschliessenden Plünderung klar, dass der Khagan es «617» nicht nötig hatte zu erklären, er ziehe sich nicht aus Angst zurück. Ganz anders 626, als ein byzantinisches Entsatzheer am Bosporos erschien.

Zu 725,15-726,3: Aus den Quellenberichten über den Avarenüberfall auf Herakleios ist klar, dass, wie oben gesagt, nur ein schnelles Reiterkontingent bis zum Blachernenviertel gekommen sein kann. Da bleibt für eine Nachhutoperation kein Platz. Und das Schweigen des C.P. im Bericht über den Avarenüberfall von «617», während zwei andere Kirchen namentlich genannt werden, kann man nur so interpretieren, dass diese wichtigere Kirche damals von den Avaren nichts zu leiden hatte. Auch Theodoros Synkellos in seiner Depositio-Homilie weiss nichts von Avaren in der Blachernenkirche. Zu Unrecht bezieht Sp. (S. 41 mit Anm. 190) S. 610,13-14 *θείας ἐκκλησίας βεβήλωσιν* auf diese Kirche. Wenn Theodor das gemeint hätte, hätte er «deiner Kirche» gesagt. Der Satz lautet: *μὴ ἐπίδοι λοιπὸν ὀφθαλμὸς ἀνθρώπων θείας ἐκκλησίας βεβήλωσιν ἢ τῆς δουλικῆς σοῦ ταύτης ἐρήμωσιν πόλεως*, d.h. «möge künftig kein Menschenauge die Schändung einer Kirche oder die Verwüstung dieser Dir wie eine Sklavin gehörenden Stadt sehen». Dabei dürfte die erste Hälfte der Bitte von der Schändung der zwei im C.P. genannten Kirchen inspiriert worden sein. Solches möge die Theotokos künftig abwenden. Nicht ausschliessen kann man natürlich die Übersetzung «der Kirche Gottes» (the divine church, Übers. Cameron in Byzantion 49, 1979, S. 55) in ganz allgemeinem Sinn, wenn auch die andere sinnvoller scheint.

Fazit: Die Ansicht von Sp. (S. 41): «Wenn man alle Indizien zusammennimmt, scheint es eher wahrscheinlich, dass die... Notizen aus dem Anhang zum Belagerungsbericht im Chronicon Paschale sich auf den Verrat der Avaren beziehen» und (S. 47): «ein gewisses Übergewicht der Argumente, die für 617 sprechen,

ist nicht zu übersehen», scheint nicht nur, sondern ist völlig ungegründet. Das C.P. bestätigt also sicher nicht die Ansicht, dass Pisides nicht so verstanden werden darf, dass die Avaren in das Blachernenviertel einschliesslich der berühmten Blachernenkirche eingedrungen wären; richtig ist aber, daß Pisides letzteres nicht ausdrücklich sagt. Aber dazu unten mehr.

Ein weiterer Grund, die übliche Interpretation von *Bellum Avaricum* V. 403-408 und die entsprechende Nachricht im C.P. über das Eindringen der Avaren in das «innere» Blachernenviertel in Zweifel zu ziehen, ist für Sp. die Annahme, dass dieser Teil mit der berühmten Kirche schon von einer neuen, von Herakleios gebauten Mauer geschützt gewesen sei (S. 34 ff.). Dazu müssen gleich zwei Quellenaussagen unterminiert werden, eine des C.P., das den Bau dieser Mauer ausdrücklich in das Jahr 626/7 setzt (S. 726,14 f.), und eine des Nikeph. Patr., der den Bau als Folge der Belagerung von 626 präsentiert (S. 18,27-19,1). Diesen Angaben stellt Sp. nun zwei andere gegenüber. Pisides spricht in V. 273 von einem schriftlichen Auftrag des Herakleios «πλέκειν τεῖχος νέον», einem Auftrag, der kaum vor Anfang Juli 626 in Konstantinopel eingetroffen sein kann. Das hilft Sp., der den Bau bald nach «617», spätestens 623 datieren möchte (Anm. 225), natürlich wenig, aber deswegen «ist hier zu fragen, ob nicht Pisides... eine... ältere Massnahme als eine solche, die durch den Brief resultiert, darstellt» (S. 39). Was werden wohl die Hörer des Gedichts dazu gedacht haben, die gegebenenfalls wussten, dass die Mauer längst stand, bevor der Brief des Kaisers kam? Es ist aber überhaupt sehr fraglich, ob Pisides aaO. über eine neue Mauer um das innere Blachernenviertel spricht. Die drei zitierten Worte stehen in einem Zusammenhang, der es kaum erlaubt, an einen völligen Neubau wie den der Herakleiosmauer zu denken, geschweige dass ein so wichtiges Werk von Pisides so unklar abgetan wäre. Hier in Übersetzung die betreffenden Verse (266 ff.) (wegen der Schwierigkeit einiger davon möglichst wortgetreu, um Fehlinterpretationen zu vermeiden): «Daher entzündete er uns durch den Elan seines Briefes... und befahl energisch, die Fundamente auf die Mauern hin sicher zu restaurieren, so wie es nötig war, an den Türmen aussen unter freiem Himmel Vorsprünge zu bauen, Palisaden zu

errichten und dazu festeingeschlagene Pfähle (den Feinden) entgegenzuwerfen und eine neue Mauer zu flechten und Geflechte von Bogenschützen zu machen und von Steinen (zum Steine werfen) schnelllaufende Maschinen und Zusammensetzungen (schnellbewegliche Batterien von Steinschleudern?).» Es ist fraglich, ob Herakleios es nötig hatte, Bonos noch schnell konkrete Festungsbauinstruktionen zu erteilen, aber auch wenn man die Verse des Pisides als dichterische Zusammenfassung einer solchen Briefstelle sehen will, ist *πλέκειν τεῖχος νέον* sensu obvio auf die vorher genannten Palisaden zu beziehen, mit denen die theodosianische Mauer (wohl nur an schwachen Stellen) verstärkt werden sollte; betrifft doch auch die unmittelbar anschliessend erwähnte Besetzung der Mauern mit einem Geflecht von Bogenschützen usw. die Mauer des Theodosios. Aus den Angaben des Pisides kann jedenfalls niemand herauslesen, dass das (innere) Blachernenviertel ummauert werden soll. Hätte aber letzteres im Brief gestanden, der Dichter, dem gerade das Blachernenviertel so wichtig ist, hätte uns darüber nicht im Unklaren gelassen. Einen Weg, den Kaiser ob solcher Fürsorge zu loben, ohne die Ehre der Gottesmutter zu schmälern, hätte er gewiss gefunden. Da soll man einen byzantinischen Dichter nicht unterschätzen. Schliesslich ist noch zu bedenken, dass Herakleios beim Verfassen seines Briefes kaum ahnen konnte, dass diese Antwort auf eine Mitteilung aus Konstantinopel über das Heranrücken der Avaren so rechtzeitig eintreffen würde, dass für die Ummauerung des Blachernenviertels noch Zeit blieb. Man erwartete von ihm wohl auch wichtigere Auskünfte, einmal wie weit man dem Khagan entgegenkommen durfte, um ihn zum freiwilligen Abzug zu bewegen, und vor allem, ob man mit einem Entsatzheer rechnen könnte. Letzteres hatte der Kaiser laut Pisides V. 280 übrigens schon vorher in Marsch gesetzt. So ist aus Pisides nicht einmal wahrscheinlich zu machen, dass im Juni 626 noch eilig mit der Ummauerung des Blachernenviertels begonnen wurde.

Für wichtiger hält Sp. eine Randnotiz in unserem Archetypus des C.P. (Vatic. gr. 1941, s.X), die den Bau der Mauer auf das 15. Jahr der Kaiserherrschaft des Herakleios datiert. Angenommen, dass die Notiz, wie das C.P., mit effektiven Kaiserjahren rechnet, ist dies das Jahr 5.10.624-4.10.625, und sie steht dann in deutlichem

Widerspruch zum C.P. und zu Nikeph. Patr. Mit Schreiner, Kleinchroniken I, S. 37 u. 39 betrachtet Sp. (S. 161) diese Notiz als eine aus einer Serie, die aus dem Megas Chronographos dem C.P. hinzugefügt wurde. Dagegen ist aber folgendes einzuwenden. Die «Serie» besteht aus 18 Notizen; 16 davon (1-12 und 15-18 ed. Schreiner, Kleinchron. I, S. 40-45) sind im genannten Cod. Vatic. auf. fol. 241^v-242^v zusammengestellt mit dem Vermerk «Aus dem Grossen Chronographen». Der gleiche Vermerk steht auch zu Nr. 13, nicht aber zu 14, der uns hier beschäftigenden Notiz. Ausserdem sind 13 und 14 nicht Teil der Serie, sondern Randnotizen zur jeweiligen Stelle, zu der sie gehören. Ungenügend begründet ist nun die von Schreiner zu 14 geäusserte und von Sp. übernommene Ansicht: «da sie von derselben Hand wie die übrigen eingetragen ist, besteht kaum Zweifel, dass sie auch dem Megas Chronographos entnommen ist». Gerade die Tatsache, dass die Herkunft wohl zur Serie (1-12 u. 15-18) und zur Einzelnotiz 13, zu 14 aber nicht vermerkt ist, spricht dagegen. Hinzu kommt, dass es hier um eine Notiz geht, die völlig anders als die übrigen geartet ist. Alle übrigen betreffen mit einer Ausnahme (Nr. 7 zum Nika-Aufstand) Ereignisse, die im Gegensatz zum Mauerbau des Herakleios im C.P. nicht erwähnt werden. Die als Serie überlieferten Notizen betreffen weiter ausschliesslich Katastrophen, und zwar bis auf den Nika-Aufstand solche, die man als τέρατα bezeichnen kann (Erdbeben 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16; Aschenregen 4; Seuchen 9,17; Einsturz des östlichen Teiles der H. Sophia 12; eine Himmelserscheinung 18). Sämtliche Notizen mit Ausnahme von 7, 13 und 14 beginnen mit ὅτι ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας usw. als Datierung; nur Nr. 7 gibt das genaue Jahr ὅτι ἐν τῷ ε' ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας Ἰουστινιανοῦ; die Notiz passt aber zu den übrigen, da nicht eigentlich über den Nika-Aufstand selbst, sondern über die verheerenden Folgen für die Stadt Konstantinopel berichtet wird. Die genaue Datierung ist bei diesem aussergewöhnlichen Ereignis auch nicht verwunderlich. Zu Nr. 13 ὅτι Μαυρίκιος usw. wird vom Schreiber der Notiz vermerkt: περὶ τεράτων ἐκ τοῦ μεγάλου χρονογράφου. Mit Recht notiert Schreiner Kleinchron. I, S. 39 Anm. 8, dass ausgerechnet diese Notiz nichts mit Wunderzeichen zu tun hat. Er begnügt sich aber mit der «Erklärung»: «Vielleicht liegt ein Versehen des Kopsis-

ten vor» (ebd.). Die Frage ist aber: Welches Versehen? Die einfachste Erklärung ist wohl: der Schreiber hat Nr. 13 einer Vorlage entnommen, die ausser dem Katastrophenauszug aus dem Megas Chronographos auch diese Notiz enthielt, die aber offenbar nicht in der Katastrophenliste stand. Er nahm sie also auch nicht darin auf, sondern übertrug sie auf den Rand seines Ms des C.P. als Ergänzung zum J. 6108. Bei der Angabe der Herkunft der Notiz charakterisierte er den Auszug als *περὶ τεράτων* und schrieb die Notiz einfach aufgrund der örtlichen Nachbarschaft in seiner Vorlage auch dem Grossen Chronographen zu, ohne zu bemerken, dass die Notiz ihres Inhalts wegen nichts mit dem Auszug aus diesem Autor zu tun haben konnte. Für die uns hier interessierende Notiz ist also anzunehmen, dass sie nicht einmal der Nachbarschaft des genannten Auszugs entnommen ist. Dazu passt, dass sie, wie gesagt, keine zusätzliche Information, aber eine Glosse ist, die den Leser darauf hinweist, dass es sich bei dem im Text genannten Haus der Theotokos um die berühmte Blachernenkirche handelt, die vorher — was nicht jedem Leser bekannt gewesen sein dürfte — ausserhalb der Stadtmauern lag und nun durch den Bau der Herakleiosmauer miteingeschlossen wurde. Das Datum hat der Autor einfach der vorausgehenden Textzeile entnommen, dabei versehentlich das 15. Jahr des Kaisersohnes Herakleios-Konstantinos von S. 726,13 auf dessen Vater Herakleios übertragend. Dass man unserem Notizenschreiber einen solchen Fehler ruhig zutrauen darf, beweist seine Qualifizierung der Notiz Nr. 13 als zur Terata-Liste des Grossen Chronographen gehörig (s.ob.). Somit hat auch die Randbemerkung zu C.P. 726,14 gegen das einmütige Zeugnis des C.P. und Nikeph. Patr. kein Gewicht.

Dass die Berichte über die Belagerung von 626 keine brauchbaren Argumente für eine frühe Datierung der Herakleiosmauer hergeben, ist eine Folgerung, wozu Specks eigene Überlegungen führen, und das, obgleich die Schwierigkeiten gegen die Annahme dieser Mauer vor 626 heruntergespielt werden. Solche Schwierigkeiten treten immer dann auf, wenn man in den Quellen irgendeine Mauer, von der die Rede ist, als die neue Mauer des Herakleios sehen will; setzt man nur die bekannten alten Befestigungsanlagen voraus, hat man nirgends Probleme. Man braucht dann auch nicht

mit Sp. (S. 34 ff.) das sogenannte Pteron (den Flügel an der theodosianischen Mauer nördlich des Anemasgefängnisses) südöstlich von der Blachernenkirche zu verlegen. Die dafür vorgebrachten Argumente wiegen die dagegensprechenden nicht auf.

Sp. meint (S. 35), für seine These spreche ἔξωθεν in der Angabe im C.P. 726,14-15 d.h., die von Herakleios gebaute Mauer liege (rundum das Haus der Gottesmutter) ausserhalb des sogenannten Pterons. Vielmehr ist das Gegenteil der Fall. Wäre das Pteron mit Sp. südöstlich von der Blachernenkirche zu suchen (s. Skizze S. 37), wäre der Zusatz «ausserhalb des Pterons» überflüssig, weil selbstverständlich. Weiter weist Sp. darauf hin, dass der Patriarch bei der Gedächtnisfeier der Befreiung von der Avarenbelagerung zuerst zur Pforte beim Pteron zog, um dann «durch ein Tor» zur Blachernenkirche zu ziehen (S. 35). Dies wäre, meint er, sinnlos, wenn das Tor nicht auf dem Weg von der H. Sophia zur Blachernenkirche liegen würde. Nun steht nirgends, dass der Patriarch *durch* ein Tor zog, wie auch Sp. selbst in Anm. 144 erkennen lässt. Und dass es Sinn hatte, an der Blachernenkirche vorbei zu einem Tor nördlich davon zu ziehen, zeigt das dort gesungene Troparion, das Sp. selbst in Anm. 143 zitiert: «unsere unbezwingbare Mauer bist Du».

Einer Verlegung des Pteron südöstlich von der Blachernenkirche steht auch die Lokalisierung der Nikolaoskirche im Wege, die im Zusammenhang mit der Belagerung von 626 genannt wird. Aus dem, was wir aus Anna Komnene und Stephanos von Novgorod wissen (s. Janin, Egl. et Mon. de Cple, S. 370), lag sie, vom Zentrum der Stadt aus gesehen, an der Blachernenkirche vorbei, und zwar sehr nahe am nördlichsten Teil der Stadtmauer, wozu auch Janins Gleichsetzung dieser Kirche mit der von Justinian I. wieder aufgebauten Kirche des Priskos und Nikolaos passt. Hier also, ausserhalb des Pterons und etwas näher am Goldenen Horn, und nicht in der Nähe der späteren, heute noch bestehenden Kirche des Demetrios Kanabes (Janin, o.c. S. 90 f.) ist der Platz zu suchen, wo die Avaren Feuer entzünden wollten, um den im Barbyesflüsschen stationierten slavischen Booten das Zeichen zu geben, im Goldenen Horn zu erscheinen und durch dieses Ablenkungsmanöver

einen Angriff auf die Stadtmauer zu unterstützen (Nikeph. Patr. 18,6-12), ein Plan, der dem byzantinischen Kommandanten Bonos bekannt wurde und ihm die Möglichkeit gab, selbst ein Feuer zu entzünden, um dadurch einen vorzeitigen Angriff der Slaven auszulösen und ihnen mit der byzantinischen Flotte eine vernichtende Niederlage beizubringen (ebd. 18, 12-21). Hier auch — zwischen dem Pteron und dem Goldenen Horn und wohl näher am letzteren — muss der Säulengang des hl. Nikolaos gelegen haben, wo laut C.P. 724,11-15 armenische Soldaten während der Schlacht im Goldenen Horn aus der «Blachernenmauer» hinausrannten, um Feuer zu legen, wodurch die Slaven aufgrund der mit den Avaren gemachten Absprache sich verführen liessen, dort Rettung zu suchen, was sie natürlich mit dem Tod bezahlen mussten. Zu Unrecht stellt Sp., da er Nikeph. Patr. 18,7-8 missversteht, diesen Ablauf in Frage (Anm. 106): «Wegen der nicht eindeutigen Formulierung des Nikeph. (brev. 18,15: Bonos verlegt die Schiffe an den Platz, ἐν ᾧ τὸ σημεῖον ἐδέδοτο — gegeben werden sollte?; (von den Avaren?) gegeben war?) braucht man nicht anzunehmen..., dass Bonos den Schiffen ein falsches Zeichen gab...». Nikeph. schreibt: «Da die Avaren auch slavische Massen mitbrachten und zu Kampfgenossen hatten, hatten sie ihnen ein Zeichen gegeben, dass, wenn sie bei der Vormauer der Blachernen, dem sogenannten Pteron, Feuer entzündet sehen würden, auch sie sofort mit ihren Einbäumen heranfahren sollten, damit sie durch ihr Erscheinen mit einer Flotte die Stadt in grosse Verwirrung stürzen und sie (die Avaren) selbst von der Seite der Mauer die Gelegenheit erhalten würden, diese zu besteigen und in die Stadt zu geraten. Das nun wurde dem Patrikios Bonos bekannt, und er rüstete selbst Diëren und Triëren und liess sie an dem Platz vor Anker gehen, wo das Zeichen gegeben war (d.h. natürlich: wofür das Zeichen vereinbart war); desgleichen sandte er auch die Diëren zum gegenüberliegenden Ufer und befahl ihnen, sofort Feuer zu machen. Als die Slaven das sahen, brachen sie aus dem sogenannten Barbyssfluss auf und fuhren gegen die Stadt». Darauf folgt die Niederlage. Es gibt also nicht den geringsten Grund, mit Sp. die Kriegslist des Bonos mit dem falschen vorzeitigen Feuersignal anzuzweifeln. Wenn Theodoros Synkellos und Pisides davon nichts «wissen», hat das

seinen Grund ganz klar darin, dass die Erwähnung der entscheidenden Kriegslist den Ruhm der wahren Siegerin schmälern könnte. Trotz der Beschreibung des Theodoros Synkellos (14,40-15,12) eines gewaltigen Angriffs zugleich zu Wasser und zu Lande ist anzunehmen, dass es wegen des vorzeitigen Erscheinens der Slaven nicht mehr zum geplanten Grossangriff zu Lande kam. Der Angriff zu Lande, den auch Pisides beschreibt (V. 417-437), war nur ein Vorangriff, der seinerseits es den Slaven erleichtern sollte, möglichst unbehindert an die Stadt heranzukommen. Weder das C.P., noch Nikeph. Patr. kennen nach der Niederlage der Slaven einen Angriff auf die Landmauer. Dazu passt auch, dass der Khagan persönlich vom Ufer des Goldenen Hornes die Niederlage der Slaven beobachtete und danach direkt zu seinem Lager zurückkehrte, s. C.P. 724,16-725,1.

Wahr und doch irreführend ist weiter Specks Bemerkung zu C.P. 724,11-15 (in Anm. 106): «Dieses Feuer (sc. das von den Armeniern entzündete) ist nicht identisch mit dem, das als Zeichen zum Aufbruch für die slavischen Schiffe bei der Bestürmung des Pteron gegeben werden sollte, da im C.P. die Katastrophe der Schiffe schon geschehen ist.» Natürlich ist es nicht identisch, denn die Avaren kamen überhaupt nicht dazu, ihr Zeichen zu geben. Das Feuer der Armenier wird aber von den Slaven ganz klar damit in Verbindung gebracht, und das ist hier das Entscheidende. Das C.P. sagt, dass die aus ihren Booten geworfenen Slaven die Armenier am Ufer wegen des Feuers für Avaren hielten (724,14-15), woraus man obendrein schliessen muss, dass über das von Avaren und Slaven vereinbarte Feuersignal auch im verlorenen Passus des C.P. 724,9 (zwischen τοὺς und ἐπόντισαν) berichtet wurde.

Wenn man Nikeph. Patr. beim Wort nimmt, sind die Slaven zuerst nur durch ein Feuer, das auf dem gegenüberliegenden Ufer, also an falscher Stelle angezündet wurde, herbeigelockt worden und laut dem C.P. wurden sie dann durch die Armenier, die einen Ausfall wagten, in eine weitere Falle gelockt. Die Kriegslist des Bonos wäre also besonders raffiniert gewesen. Er hätte sich ausgerechnet, dass die Slaven vom Barbyssfluss aus nicht würden feststellen können, dass das (erste) Feuer nicht genau an der vereinbarten Stelle rauchte. Ein Blick auf eine Karte des Umlands

von Konstantinopel zeigt dies eindeutig. Nachdem dann die Slaven an der vereinbarten Stelle angekommen waren, müssen die Byzantiner ihnen klar gemacht haben, dass sie auf ein falsches Feuersignal hereingefallen waren. Worauf das Feuer der Armenier an der richtigen Stelle, das dann wohl auch im Auftrag des Bonos gelegt wurde, den verzweifelten Slaven wie die Rettung in der Not erscheinen musste. Da aber die Quellen nicht ausdrücklich bezeugen, dass es so war, bleibt es unsicher, ob man die Angabe des Nikeph. Patr. so genau nehmen darf,

Nach diesen Richtigstellungen muss es als eine unzulässige Behauptung zurückgewiesen werden, wenn Sp. schreibt (S. 48): «dass die Avaren sich im Blachernenviertel und speziell in der Blachernenkirche verschanzt hätten,... ist nach dem oben Gesagten *aufgrund der Quellen* auszuschliessen». Für diese Ansicht sind nur einseitige Interpretationen und Hypothesen vorgebracht worden. Aber trotz Ablehnung dieser Interpretationen und Hypothesen, ist mit Sp. S. 30 und Ann. 102, jedoch aus anderen Gründen, auch die Ansicht von Barisić, Pertusi und Stratos abzulehnen, dass die Avaren, sei es am 6. August (Stratos), sei es am 7. (Barisić u. Pertusi) die Blachernenkirche im Sturm nahmen und sich dort verschanzten, (Es stimmt, gegen Sp. Anm. 102, übrigens nicht, dass Barisić sich vorsichtiger ausdrückt als Pertusi und Stratos, die ihm nur gefolgt sind. Barisić, *Le siège, Byzantion* 24, 1954, S. 387 über den 7. August: «Dans le premier assaut, la cavallerie de Haganos prit la Théotocos des Blachernes et ses environs et s'y fortifia»). Mit Recht betont Sp., dass der angebliche Gewährsmann, Pisides V. 403-408, so viel nicht hergibt. Es heisst dort: «Endlich nun (d.h. nach vorausgehenden Brandstiftungen) begannen die Barbaren den Kampf; sie nahmen die Plätze des Richters und des Feldherrn, der unbesiegbaren Magd, und hatten sie gleichsam als Schilde; und sie wollten die von ihnen auf gottlose Weise geschändeten (Plätze? oder Richter und Feldherr?) unter Zwang zu Mitwirkenden haben». Diese Worte bleiben verständlich, auch wenn man annimmt, dass die Avaren nur den äusseren Teil des Blachernenviertels (nördlich des Pterons) besetzten und zu ihrer Operationsbasis machten. Wichtiger aber scheint mir, dass Pisides nicht nur topographisch, sondern auch chronologisch vage bleibt, so dass

eine Beziehung der Stelle auf den 7. August willkürlich ist. Wie kombiniert man aber am einfachsten Pisides und das C.P., ohne gleich mit jsp. ihren Informationsgehalt in Frage zu stellen? Von den Quellen ausgehend muss man annehmen:

1. Die Mauer des Herakleios um das «innere» Blachernenviertel gab es während der Belagerung von 626 noch nicht (C.P. u. Nikeph. Patr.).

2. Die Avaren waren in der Blachernenkirche (C.P.; Pisides?).

3. Das Pteron lag nördlich der Blachernenkirche (s.ob.).

Es ist a priori unwahrscheinlich, dass die Avaren sich im inneren Blachernenviertel eingenistet hätten, da ihnen der Rückzug zwischen Pteron und Goldenem Horn zu leicht abgeschnitten werden konnte. Die Kriegslist des Bonos, der Schiffe das Goldene Horn hinaufschickt bis zum Pteron setzt voraus, dass diesen aus dem inneren Blachernenviertel keine ernste Gefahr drohte. Der Ausfall der Armenier sowie die Niederbrennung der Nikolaoskirche durch die Nachhut der Avaren beweisen aber, dass normalerweise der Landstreifen zwischen Pteron und Goldenem Horn den Avaren zugänglich war. Nichts ist also selbstverständlicher, als dass sie während der zehntägigen Belagerung vorübergehend auch in das innere Blachernenviertel eindrangen und dabei auch der Muttergotteskirche «einen Besuch abstatteten», ohne nennenswerten Schaden anzurichten, was sie ja auch in den anderen Kirchen in ihrem Bereich erst taten, als Rachegefühle über die Niederlage sie dazu trieben. Bis zur Blachernenkirche wagten sie sich dann aber schon nicht mehr vor. Die ganz natürlich zu erklärende Schonung der Blachernenkirche wurde aber von den Byzantinern selbstverständlich (s. C.P.) als Eingreifen Gottes gedeutet.

Zum Avarenaufenthalt im inneren Blachernenviertel sei schliesslich noch bemerkt, dass Sp. S. 52 mit Anm. 261 nicht nur völlig überflüssig, sondern auch unzulässig die Behauptung aufstellt, dass aufgrund des literarischen Genus, das Pisides vertritt, Informationen, die er allein bietet, anders gedeutet werden müssen, was mit der angeblichen Verschanzung der Avaren in der Blachernenkirche illustriert wird. Es handelt sich hier nicht um eine Information, die Pisides als epischer Dichter erfunden hat, sondern um eine Fehlinterpretation einer durchaus zutreffenden, wenn auch etwas

einseitigen Information.

Anlässlich der Nachricht des C.P. über das Eintreffen eines Entsatzheeres unter Führung des Kaiserbruders Theodoros erörtert Sp. (S. 44 ff.) auch die Frage, ob schon früher eine von Herakleios gesandte Verstärkung in Konstantinopel eingetroffen war, wie man «bis auf Stratos» angenommen hat. (Der Verweis auf Barisić 389 A. 7, in Anm. 213, ist in 378 mit A. 6 zu korrigieren). Mit Recht bemerkt Sp., dass weder Theodoros Synkellos, noch Pisides oder Theophanes, die alle die Absendung eines Kontingents durch Herakleios erwähnen, mitteilen, ob es rechtzeitig ankam. Aber das ist genau so wenig verwunderlich wie ihr Schweigen über das Eintreffen des Theodoros. Sie feiern keinen Sieg von kämpfenden Soldaten, sondern einen Sieg der waffenlosen Theotokos. Aufgrund des Berichts des C.P. über das Kommen des Theodoros stellt sich nun die Frage, ob die laut den genannten Quellen von Herakleios zu Hilfe gesandten Truppen jene des Theodoros gewesen sein könnten. Zu Theoph. S. 315,11-15 passt das nicht, da dieser ausdrücklich von einer Dreiteilung des Heeres durch Herakleios spricht (nicht in gleiche Teile, wie Pertusi S. 217 anzunehmen scheint); ein Teil zieht nach Konstantinopel, ein Teil mit Theodoros gegen den Perser Shahin und ein Teil mit Herakleios ins Khazarenland. Sp. schreibt nun dazu (S. 46): «bei der Abfassung dieses Berichts ist wohl eingetreten, dass der Verfasser von den drei Heeresabteilungen auf eine entsprechende Dreizahl von «wunderbaren» Erfolgen geführt wurde», und er stellt wegen dieser primär literarisch-theologischen Tendenz den Informations-gehalt des Berichts in Frage. Das aber stellt die Dinge auf den Kopf. Theophanes könnte höchstens von der historisch unbezweifelbaren Dreizahl der wunderbaren Erfolge (gegen die Perser, gegen die Avaren und bei den Khazaren) auf eine Dreiteilung des Heeres verfallen sein, aber nicht umgekehrt. Die Dreiteilung des Heeres hat aber nichts mit einer theologischen Tendenz zu tun, da wunderbare Siege von Gott oder der Theotokos kommen, die auf Heere verzichten können. In seinem Bericht über die Befreiung der Hauptstadt vergisst Theophanes dann auch prompt die dazu von Herakleios ausgesandte Heeresabteilung. Die Frage aber, ob diese rechtzeitig in Konstantinopel eintraf, lässt sich mit grosser Wahrscheinlichkeit aus

dem C.P. (718, 4 ff.) positiv beantworten. Sobald man in Konstantinopel den Khagan kommen sah, sandten die Archonten den Patrikios Athanasios zu ihm, um zu verhandeln. Stratos (I S. 174) meint, dass Herakleios selbst aus Sebasteia den Athanasios zum Khagan sandte; das aber kann nicht sein, da dieser seine Sendung ausdrücklich den «Archonten» zuschreibt (C.P. 718,14-15), was natürlich nicht auf Herakleios bezogen werden kann. Athanasios versprach bei diesem Treffen dem Avarenherrscher offenbar ein grosses Entgegenkommen. Als er, zurück in Konstantinopel, darüber rapportierte, wurde er deswegen getadelt; er wehrte sich aber, dass so sein Auftrag gewesen sei und dass er auch noch nichts von der Verstärkung der Mauern und der Anwesenheit eines Heeres an Ort und Stelle erfahren hätte. Er erklärt sich nun zwar bereit, erneut zum Khagan zu gehen, um eine härtere Position zu vertreten, will aber zuvor das Heer sehen. Darauf zeigt man ihm ein Korps von 12.000 Reitern. Dabei müssen zumindest auch Verstärkungen gewesen sein, die erst nach Athanasios' Abreise eingetroffen waren, sonst hat der ganze Passus keinen Sinn. Es kann sich also bei diesen 12.000 nicht, wie Sp. in Anm. 215 behauptet, um die in die Stadt zurückgezogenen Reitertruppen handeln, «die normalerweise an der Langen Mauer und in ihrem Vorfeld operieren». («Der Nachweis kann hier nicht erbracht werden» heisst es dazu). Die Anwesenheit dieser Truppen war Athanasios natürlich bekannt, denn er war nicht, wie Sp. (ebd.) schreibt, von den Avaren in Adrianopel gefangen und dann von ihnen als Gesandter benutzt worden, sondern er wurde laut C.P. 718,15 als Gesandter dorthin geschickt (ἀπέλυσεν 718, 5 heisst nicht: liess frei, sondern: entliess, dimisit. Dass die Sendung des Athanasios erst hier erwähnt wird, ist wohl auf ungeschickte Quellenbenutzung des Osterchronisten zurückzuführen). Zu Stratos (s.ob.) ist noch zu bemerken, dass er (l.c.) nicht die Ankunft von Verstärkungen, sondern nur (angeblich gegen Pernice und Pertusi) ihre Gleichsetzung mit den genannten 12.000 Reitern leugnet. (Pertusi S. 216 schreibt übrigens, dass diese Gleichsetzung durch Pernice «non risulta delle fonti»). Was man Athanasios zeigte, war vermutlich das ganze Reiteraufgebot, also die inzwischen eingetroffenen Verstärkungen eingeschlossen.

Im Lichte dieser Stelle des C.P. ist Pisides V. 280 (nach Erwähnung des kaiserlichen Briefes mit Instruktionen für die Ver-

teidigung): «eine Menge Soldaten hatte er schon vorher abgeschickt» gewiss dahingehend zu interpretieren, dass diese auch rechtzeitig eingetroffen waren. Die Hörer des Gedichts wussten das. Er brauchte sich also nicht klarer auszudrücken. Ausserdem, wären sie zu spät gekommen, hätte er sie wohl lieber totgeschwiegen. Aus dem C.P. 718,2-719,1 geht weiter hervor, dass die Verstärkungen gross genug waren, um dem Khagan nun eine selbstbewusste Antwort zu erteilen und es auf eine Belagerung ankommen zu lassen. Dass Pisides und Theodoros Synkellos einen anderen Eindruck erwecken, ist in wahrstem Sinne des Wortes eine fromme Übertreibung. Und dass Pisides, wie Sp. S. 44 behauptet, V. 320-322 «herausstellt, dass die Verteidigung in den Händen von Leuten lag, die nicht mit dem Kriegshandwerk vertraut waren», stimmt nicht. Pisides sagt nur, dass Patriarch Sergios und die zivilen Verantwortlichen, die auch beim Kampf anwesend waren, an solchen Einsatz nicht gewohnt waren.

Zum Abzug der Avaren in 626 stellt Sp. (S. 46) noch die Frage, warum der Khagan dabei noch um einen Unterhändler bat (C.P. 726, 4-5), und sieht höchstens einen «Anlass» dazu in der Tatsache, dass der Avar noch byzantinische Geiseln in der Hand hatte. Der Anlass war doch wohl eher die Angst vor byzantinischer Rache, nachdem das siegreiche Heer des Theodoros angekommen war und der Khagan mit den ernststen Folgen der Slavenniederlage fertig werden musste; die byzantinischen Geiseln in seiner Hand waren seine Chance, durch Verhandlungen seine Lage zu verbessern. Die byzantinische Antwort, Theodoros, der gerade den Bosphoros überquerte, werde ihn bis zu seinem Land begleiten und dort könnten sie dann mit einander sprechen (C.P. 726,7-10), macht klar, wie sehr sich das Blatt gewendet hatte.

Zurück zur Rolle der Theotokos, dem zentralen Motiv des Pisides. Zu Specks Kommentierung dieser Rolle noch ein paar Bemerkungen.

Aus nichts geht hervor, dass nach dem guten Ausgang des Avarenüberfalls von «617» die Muttergottes der Blachernen als Retterin aus dieser Not gefeiert wurde. Nicht einmal Theodoros Synkellos, *In depositionem*, schreibt ihr die damalige Befreiung aus der Avarengefahr zu. Bei ihm ist es nur die *Philanthropia* Gottes, die diese erwirkte (S. 599, 1-3). Den Avarenüberfall erwähnt er nur

als Anlass eines wunderbaren Gunstbeweises Gottes, der Wiederentdeckung des Kleides der Gottesmutter, die wohl mit dem Avarenüberfall ihren Ausgang nahm, aber deren entscheidende Phase (die Feststellung der Unversehrtheit) erst einige Zeit danach erfolgte. Der Reliquie wird in Theodors Homilie nichts zugeschrieben. Nur einmal wird sie ein Geschenk Gottes genannt, das die Theotokos der Stadt zu ihrem Schutz gab (S. 600,5-7). Ansonsten wird Maria nur ganz allgemein um Schutz angefleht («Wende alle Barbaren ab... und zeige, dass die Stadt durch deine Macht ummauert wird» (S. 610,15-611,3). Wäre die Rettung von «617» die übrigens weniger die Stadt als den Kaiser betraf von den Zeitgenossen der neuentdeckten Reliquie zugeschrieben worden, ist es völlig unverständlich, dass sie, wie aus dem totalen Schweigen der zuverlässigen Quellen als sicher gelten muss, 126 keine Rolle gespielt hat.

Wenn Sp. weiter meint (S. 54), dass im ersten Epigramm des Pisides auf die Blachernenkirche (A.P. 1 120) «an manchen Stellen ein Bezug uf 617 sozusagen durchschimmert» und dass der Dichter die «unbewusste Absicht» hatte, die Ereignisse von 617 in denen von 626 aufgehen zu lassen, kann er dafür nur nichtssagende Gemeinplätze oder Fehlinterpretationen der Ereignisse von «617» (s. ob.) vorbringen. Es ist also nicht bewiesen, «dass im Jahre 617 Maria zum ersten Mal als Beschützerin der Stadt erwiesen wurde» (S. 48). Wenn Theodoros Synkellos in seiner Predigt auf die Befreiung aus der Belagerung von 626 den Khagan in «617» sagen lässt: «Es gibt keinen Gott, und die Stadt wird auch nicht durch die Magd als Mauer und den Arm der göttlichen Macht geschützt», ist das eine nachträgliche Deutung eines Mannes, der inzwischen 626 erlebt hat, und somit für «617» ohne Beweiskraft. (Ich korrigiere den korrupten Text $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\chi\epsilon\sigma\iota$ τῇ Παρθένῳ übrigens anders als Sp. in Anm. 236, der nach $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\chi\epsilon\sigma\iota$ eine Lücke vermutet. Die Änderung von $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\chi\epsilon\sigma\iota$ in $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\chi\epsilon\iota$ empfiehlt sich m.E. als die einfachere Korrektur, ja ist vielleicht sogar nicht nötig [Magd = Mauern]).

Mit vielen Wenn und Aber Kommentiert Sp. schliesslich (S. 49-50 mit Anm. 247) die Verse 457-461, sich fragend ob hier von einer vorübergegangenen Bedrohung der Blachernenkirche die Rede sei. Da ich diese Verse anders verstehe als Pertusi und Speck, muss ich

sie hier zuerst zitieren: Ξένον γὰρ οὐδέν, εἰ <προ> πολεμῇ Παρθένος / δι' ἧς παρῆλθεν εἰς τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς σέβας, / οὐκ οἶδα πῶς πεμφθεῖσα, ῥομφαία πάλιν· / ὅμως παρῆλθεν ἢ διῆλθεν ὁξέως, / τρώσασα τὴν ἄτρωτον οὐδαμοῦ φύσιν.

Pertusi und Sp. beziehen beide ἧς auf Παρθένος, aber geben διὰ nicht den gleichen Sinn. Pertusi nimmt es lokal und übersetzt «attraverso cui penetrò... una spada... nella sua anima veneranda», d.h. er setzt die Magd mit ihrer körperlichen Hülle gleich, was wenig plausibel erscheint. Sp. versucht anscheinend dieser Schwierigkeit zu entgehen und versteht διὰ kausal (instrumental) «mittels ihrer» (Anm. 245). Er übersetzt: «durch sie ging (wirkungslos) ein Schwert vorüber, das — ich weiss nicht wie — wieder gegen τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς σέβας gerichtet war; jedenfalls ging es vorüber oder schnell hindurch, ohne die unverletzliche Natur zu verletzen.» Hier wird «gemogelt». Jeder vermutet hinter «durch sie» διὰ mit accusativ («thanks to»). In Wirklichkeit macht Sp. laut Anm. 245 Maria zum Instrument des Schwertes, das Subjekt des Satzes ist. Das geht natürlich nicht. Weiter sucht Sp. hinter παρῆλθεν eine Anspielung auf Matth. 26,39 (lass diesen Kelch an mir vorübergehen), was nun wirklich abwegig ist. Ausser dem Wort παρῆλθεν hat unser Vers mit der Matthaiosstelle nichts gemein. Um παρῆλθεν mit «ging (wirkungslos) vorüber» übersetzen zu können, löst Sp. es von εἰς τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς σέβας, das er zu πεμφθεῖσα zieht. Das aber zerstört den klaren (und auch von Sp. gesehenen) Bezug auf Luc. 2,35 (deine Seele wird ein Schwert durchbohren). Ein Schwert, das vorübergeht, trifft nicht; πάλιν, von Sp. auf πεμφθεῖσα bezogen, gehört aufgrund dieses Bezugs zu παρῆλθεν εἰς. Bei Lukas ist nicht die Rede von einem Schwert, das nur auf die Seele der Gottesmutter gerichtet war, sondern das es durchbohrte. Dort liegt klar die Parallele. Ausserdem braucht man keine unverletzliche Natur, um durch ein vorübergehendes Schwert nicht verwundet zu werden. Auch muss παρῆλθεν wegen παρῆλθεν ἢ διῆλθεν einen dem von διῆλθεν nahekommenden Sinn haben und nicht wie bei Sp. das völlige Gegenteil bedeuten. Da also Pertusis Übersetzung wenig plausibel und die von Sp. völlig unmöglich erscheint, beziehe ich ἧς nicht auf Παρθένος, sondern entnehme ἧς ein Antezedent αὐτῆς zu προπολεμῇ und denke dabei an Konstan-

tinopel. «Es ist ja auch gar kein Wunder, wenn die Magd Krieg führt für (die), durch die erneut ein Schwert, ich weiss nicht wie lanciert, in ihre ehrwürdige Seele drang; jedoch es drang ein oder durchbohrte (Luc. 2,35) scharf (oder schnell), ohne die unverletz-bare Natur zu verletzen.» «Durch die» ist also lokal zu nehmen, aber in übertragenem Sinne; der Weg des Schwertes in die Seele der Theotokos führt über die Stadt Konstantinopel. (Zu παρέρ-χομαι εἰς s. übrigens Liddell-Scott s.v. III).

Wie Sp. weiter aus diesen Versen (in Anm. 247) den Gedanken herausliest: «Wie Christus auferstand, wird auch die Stadt nicht untergehen», ist mir gleich rätselhaft wie die angebliche Variation zu V. 6-7, wo es heisst: «Es musste sein, dass sie, die damals ohne Samen (ohne menschliche Befruchtung), nun so ohne (menschliche) Waffen Rettung gebahr.» (Sp. übersetzt ἀσπόρως mit «un-versehr», wodurch das ganze Bild zerstört wird). Der Versuch schliesslich, die Worte τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς σέβας (die Ehrwürdigkeit der Seele) mit V. 4 des ersten Epigramms auf die Blachernenkirche in Verbindung zu bringen, wo der Ausdruck τὸ τοῦ τόπου σέβας benutzt wird, um dann in den erstgenannten Worten die Blachernenkirche mitklingen zu hören, ist ganz weit hergeholt. Das einzige, was die beiden Stellen verbindet, ist die gleiche dichterische Umschreibung mit τὸ σέβας für locus venerandus bzw. anima veneranda.

Die ganze Stelle V. 457-461 bleibt so vage wie die Verse 404-405 über die τοποι der Blachernitissa. Klar ist, dass Pisides es deshalb «kein Wunder» nennt, dass Maria 626 für die Stadt kämpfte, weil das Schwert der Avaren sich gerade gegen ihr Stadtviertel richtete und sie dadurch in ihre Seele traf; klar ist auch, dass dieses Schwert gegen ihre unverletz-bare Natur nichts vermochte, und darum — muss man wohl dazu denken — auch nichts gegen die Stadt. (Vgl. Theod. Synk. In depositionem S. 605, 1 ff., wo Maria die Unvergänglichkeit ihrer Natur ihrem Kleid mitteilt). Überlegungen, um mit Hilfe dieser Stelle die Frage nach dem Eindringen der Avaren in das Blachernenviertel zu lösen, sind nutzlos.

Fazit: Es ist wohl doch manchmal besser, mehr den eigenen Hypothesen als den Quellen zu misstrauen.

THE RISE OF THE TURCOMAN MARITIME PRINCIPALITIES IN ANATOLIA, BYZANTIUM, AND CRUSADES

HALIL INALCIK / CHICAGO, III.

The *Destan* (*Book of Exploits*) of Umur Pasha, an unusually rich Turkish source for the history of the Aegean world and crusades in the period 1328-1348, has attracted the attention of Turcologists and Byzantinists from the time of its discovery and publication in 1929 by Mükrimin Halil Yinanç.¹ Recently, Paul Lemerle devoted a whole volume² with a detailed analysis of the information contained in the *Destan*³ in light of the contemporary Byzantine and Western sources.

¹ *Düsturname-i Enverî*, Istanbul: Türk Tarih Encümeni Külliyyati, no.15, 1929; in his introduction Yinanç attracted for the first time attention to important points *Düsturname* contained.

² *L'émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident, Recherches sur "La Geste d'Umur Pacha"*. Bibliothèque Byzantine: Etudes no.2, Paris 1957

³ It is translated into French by Irène Mélikoff-Sayar, *Le Destan d'Umur Pacha* (*Düsturname-i Enverî*), Bibliothèque Byzantine no.2, Documents: no.2, Paris 1953; Lemerle relies on this translation which is based on two manuscripts with improvements over Yinanç's edition; on the work see Mélikoff-Sayar, 27-38.

The present paper is an attempt at re-interpreting certain points in the *Destan* which have not received adequate attention. In the first part we shall examine the true nature of Umur's relations with Byzantium and Latins, and his strategy in the face of the crusades. In the second part we will turn to the organization of his navy and army.

The fall of Acre (1291) did not bring an end to the crusader peril in the Muslim world. Western Christendom was still unchallenged on the seas of the Eastern Mediterranean, and had the advantage of being able to land at any time on the coasts, which had remained the boundaries between Islam and Christendom. The Christian predominance on the sea was acknowledged by the Mamluks.⁴ In fact, in the period after 1291 a blockade ordered by the Pope of the Eastern Mediterranean lands of Egypt, Syria, and Turkey seriously threatened to cut the supply lines of commodities vital to the Mamluks – arms, timber, iron, and most important of all, slaves. Since these materials were imported from Turkey, or through the Aegean Sea from the Black Sea, the islands of the Eastern Mediterranean assumed an unusual importance in Western strategy. As a result of this new situation, the *udj* (frontier) Turcomans in Anatolia, dependent for their part on exporting their timber and slaves to Egypt, were brought into a closer relationship with the Mamluks.

The crucial development in the new period of struggle between Islam and Christendom was, in the first half of the fourteenth century, the rise of Turkish navies manned by *sea ghazis* (*ghuzat fi'l-bahr*),⁵ who were later to form the original core on which Otto-

⁴ See D. Ayalon, "Bahriyya", *EI*², pp. 945-46; as a defence measure, Mamluks completed the demolition of all fortresses on Syrian coasts and stationed Turcomans who were both warlike and cheap to hire, along the coasts to maintain guard: see D. Ayalon, "The Wafidiya in the Mamluk Kingdom", *Islamic Culture*, XXX (1951), 89-104. Ramon Lull (1305) counted it as one of the advantages which the Christians had over the Muslims; see A.S. Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, London 1938, 81.

⁵ See Al- 'Umarī, *Masālik al-absār*, ed. F. Taeschner, *Al-'Umarī's Bericht über Anatolien*. Leipzig 1929, 43-52.

man sea power was founded. The emergence of *sea ghazis* can be seen as a continuation of the Turkish expansion towards the West. Turkish *azebs* (from Arabic 'azab), the fighting men on these flotillas, were identical in origin, motivation and organization with the frontier *ghazis*. One of the first results of this new set of circumstances was the shift to the North of the crusaders' main field of action, in the end leaving Egypt and Syria out of the actual struggle.

Anatolian Turks were not totally inexperienced on the sea before the maritime principalities — Menteshe, Aydın, Sarukhan, Karasi — came into being in Western Anatolia in the fourteenth century. As early as the period 1080-1097, Turkish maritime principalities with their own arsenals and fleets had appeared on the Aegean and Marmara sea coasts. Though short-lived, they had the potential to become serious threats to Byzantium. Tzachas (Chaka), one of these Seljuk emirs based on Smyrna, grew so powerful on the sea that he even contemplated conquering Byzantium.⁶

These first Turkish maritime emirates soon disappeared as a result of the first crusade. It was only in the beginning of the 13th century that the Seljukid state again gained access to the sea, through the conquest, consequent to the Byzantine debacle of 1204, of the area between Caria and Cilicia which contained the important ports of Antalya (Satalia) and Alanya (Alaiye, Greek: Caloronos, Latin: Candelore), 1207-1226.⁷ The Seljukids soon had their own navy and arsenal at Alanya.⁸ They nevertheless did not pursue an aggressive policy on the sea, choosing rather to develop commercial relations with Christian nations by granting capitulations.

⁶ S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor*, Berkeley 1971, Index: Tzachas and Abu'l-Kasim.

⁷ See Barbara Flemming, *Landschaftsgeschichte von Pamphylien, Pisidien und Lykien im Spätmittelalter*, Wiesbaden 1964, 1-8.

⁸ For a description of the arsenal see R. M. Riefstahl, *Turkish Architecture in Southwestern Anatolia*, Cambridge, Mass. 1930.

In the second half of the thirteenth century this situation did not change, in spite of the expansion along the Mediterranean coasts of aggressive *ghazi* forces under the Karamanids in Isauria and Cilicia and the Hamid dynasty in Pamphylia and Lycia.⁹ Apparently the Muslim pirates referred to in these waters were never able to organize themselves into the pirate flotillas that were to be seen later on in the Aegean. Perhaps, this was because the Latins by holding the strategic points were able to prevent the Turks from establishing control of the southern coast of Asia Minor. Christian fleets patrolled these waters continually from the time the Pope ordered the blockade of Islamic lands in 1291. In 1293 a Venetian fleet of 20 galleys succeeded in capturing Alanya from the Turks. Although the Karamanids soon took it back,¹⁰ the Latin maritime states and the Hospitallers by that time had under their control a series of naval outposts ranging from the bay of Macri in Caria as far as Cilicia. The little island of Meis (Castello Rosso) for example, located only a few miles from the mainland, was transformed by the Hospitallers into a watchpost in constant communication with the main forces on Rhodes, thereby aiding in the prevention of Turkish raids. Following the Turcoman invasion of Western Anatolia the large scale and successful raids of the Turks on the sea began. Perhaps now the Turkish corsairs and seamen of the southern coasts of Anatolia shifted their activities to Caria and other Aegean ports. The first of the *ghazi* principalities of Western Anatolia was founded by a certain Monteshe who apparently bore the official Seljukid title of *Sahil-Begi* (in Pachymeres *Salpakis*), that is lord of the coasts.¹² Conquering from the sea, he appears to have achieved control by 1269 of the entire coastal area of Caria, including the

⁹ Flemming, *op.cit.*, 27-92.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 62-63.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 71-72.

¹² *Ibid*, Index: *Malik al-Sawahil*.

ports of Strobilos, Stadia and Trachia. Himself a sea man, he set up a strong maritime principality by organizing the Turcomans from the interior "who used to descend to the coastal plains for winter pastures".¹³ A contemporary Byzantine source, Pachymeres, explicitly states that Mentеше used the Carian ports for his sea raids. Further north at Anaea (Ania) in the Ephesus bay, a rallying point for Aegean pirates in this period, Turkish corsairs were firmly settled by 1278.¹⁴

Before the Turkish invasions of western Anatolia the greater part of Byzantine shipbuilding and naval forces were based in certain harbors along the Aegean, Propontide and Black Sea coasts. These locations were determined by the character of the forests in the mountains behind, where sailors, or corsairs, and those with shipbuilding skills were assembled. We find that Turkish fleets came into being in the same harbors as had existed under the Lascarids: Ania, Ephesus, Smyrna, Adramyttion (Edremid) on the Aegean; Karamides (Kemer?), Pegai (Kara-Biga), Cyzicus (Aydıncık), Cios (Gemilik) on the Propontide.¹⁵ The dismantling of the Byzantine navy in 1284 had meant the discharge of these Greek sailors and unemployment for local craftsmen and traders. The seamen, turned corsair, were ready now not to fight, but to cooperate with the new-comers.¹⁶ Turkish begs offered the native Greeks exactly

¹³ See Paul Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentеше, Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasien im 13.-15. Jh.*, reprint: Amsterdam 1967, 24, 32.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 33.

¹⁵ H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer*, Paris 1966, *Index*.

¹⁶ Before the Turks came, the islands and harbours of eastern Aegean sheltered a number of Greek and Latin corsairs. Venice tried to stop the unprecedented extension of their activities by imposing an indemnification upon the Byzantine emperor. A Venetian report dated 1278 mentioned ninety of those Greek corsairs: see Wilhelm Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant*, I, trans. F. Raynaud, Leipzig 1936, 443; in 1278 on Carian coasts a Greek corsair by the name of Nicetas was cooperating with a certain Saladinus, obviously a Muslim corsair, see Wittek, 46.

what they needed — employment and economic activity at those port towns through booty raids. Over time, some of these ports developed from *ghazi* pirate bases into important commercial centers.¹⁷

While native Greeks formed the professional crew of the first Turkish *ghazi* ships, the fighting men were the same *ghazi* Turks that we see later on in Umur beg's and the early Ottoman navies. Just as local Greek frontier lords, *tekvurs*, allied themselves with Turkish frontier begs in the interior, similarly many Greek notables and corsairs at these harbors must have joined cause with the *ghazi* begs. After all, they were to fight and to plunder the same enemies as before — the Latins occupying the Aegean islands, the Morea and mainland Greece.¹⁸ Unquestionably a conciliatory attitude on the part of these Turkish begs toward the local Greek population greatly facilitated the latter's participation and cooperation. The begs, in organizing the *ghazis* and the Greek sailors into successful sea raiding forces, played a decisive role in creating a new and functioning society at these ports.

In the period 1280-1344 the Aegean was the site of a struggle to fill the vacuum created by the crumbling of Byzantine rule. The struggle took place between, on the one hand, the Italian maritime states with their overriding commercial interests, and Latin feudal lords perpetuating the traditions and heritage of the classic period of the crusades, and on the other hand the newly arrived Turks,

¹⁷ On Ephesus and Palatia during this period see Heyd, *op. cit.*, I, p. 540-44; Clive Foss, *Ephesus after Antiquity: A Late antique, Byzantine and Turkish City*, London 1979, 141-80; for the *ghazis* in Anatolia see P. Wittek, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire*, London 1938, 16-32.

¹⁸ Since 1273 Palaeologi were employing corsairs based at Ania and Rhodes against Venetians. For Greeks' hatred against Venetians see the report of 1278 summarized in Heyd, I, 442-43. Seeking employment, many Greek sailors, however, went over to Venetians, see A. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, Cambridge, Mass. 1972, 64.

impelled to expansion primarily by demographic and economic pressures. While the Turks were invading western Anatolia, the Genoese captured the east Aegean islands and contributed to the economic and political collapse of Byzantium.¹⁹ The fierce rivalry between the two Italian states, the unprecedented expansion of corsary activity, and the alienation of the native Greek population from their Latin masters prepared and eased the way for the Turkish explosion into the Aegean world. The domination of the Aegean, its islands and surrounding continental areas, became the most important international question of the first half of the fourteenth century and thus accounted for the shift of crusading activities into the Aegean.

Little is known about the sea raids of the Turks before Umur Beg since our only sources are Western reports which recorded the raids but neglected to report their point of origin. It seems that Rhodes was in serious danger of being conquered by the Turks of Menteshe before the Knights of St. John settled there.²⁰ The first real threat to the Eastern Aegean islands, however, seems to have shown itself in 1304, when Ephesus and its bay area came under the control of the Menteshe Turks under Sasa Beg, and soon after passed to the control of the Turks under Mehmed Beg of Aydın-ili.²¹ Rhodes, Chios and Mytilene now came under Turkish attacks.²² Mytilene was invaded and pillaged in 1307 by the Turks under "Khlamouz" (the Greek *Kalames*), obviously *Kalem Beg* of the Karasi Turks.²³

¹⁹ Recent studies on the early Palaeologi leave no doubt on this point; in addition to Laiou, D. Geanakoplos, *The Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, Cambridge, Mass. 1959; U.V. Bosch, *Andronikos II Palaiologos*, Amsterdam 1965.

²⁰ A.de Vertot, *Histoire des Chevaliers Hospitaliers*, II, Paris 1737, 101; A. Luttrell, "The Hospitallers at Rhodes", *A History of the Crusades*, III, ed. Kenneth Setton, Madison 1975, 283.

²¹ Wittek, *op.cit.*, 37-45.

²² J. Delaville Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes (1310-1421)*, reprint: London 1974, 5-12; H. Prutz, *Die Anfänge der Hospitaliter*, Munich 1908; A Luttrell, *The Hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes, Greece and the West (1291-1440)*, London 1978.

²³ Wittek, *op.cit.*, 19,21,29.

In the period 1300-1329 the Genoese and the Hospitallers appeared to be the chief rivals of the Turks vying to replace the dissolving Byzantine rule in the Eastern Aegean. A contemporary historian, Pachymeres, described the situation as follows: «Seeing that Andronicus II was neglecting the islands of Chios and Mytilene and since their occupation would make their own position untenable, the Italians asked the Basileus either to secure their proper defense himself, or to entrust the islands to them so that with the revenues derived from them they could build a fleet to defend them».²⁴ Chios was occupied by the Genoese Benedetto I Zaccaria in 1304, while Rhodes came under the Hospitallers' possession with the naval cooperation of a Genoese corsair (15 August, 1308).

The Turks, in invading and settling the mainland, must have realized that it was too risky for them to attempt to occupy the island without having first established full control of the sea. The Latins demonstrated their supremacy on the sea in the naval battle of July 23, 1319, in which a Turkish fleet from Ephesus under Mehmed Beg, a full ten galleys and eighteen smaller ships in strength, was surprised and destroyed by the allied fleet of the Genoese and the Hospitallers.²⁵ Then, until the 1320's the Greek and Genoese corsairs were much more destructive to Venetian possessions and traffic in the Aegean than were the Turks. In the period 1307-1326, the Venetians succeeded in getting the emperor to agree to pay indemnification for the damages done by the Greeks.²⁶

²⁴ I quote Paul Lemerle's translation: *L'émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident*, Paris 1957, 91 note 5.

²⁵ See D. Le Roux, *op.cit.*, 8-10; Lemerle, *op.cit.*, 30-31.

²⁶ For the agreement between the emperor and the *Genoese* on Chios see F. Dölger, *Regesten*, IV, no. 2259, 2349, 2506; compare it with the words of Sanudo on the crucial role the Genoese and the Hospitallers played in keeping the Turks away from the Aegean: Laiou, "Marino Sanudo Torsello, Byzantium and the Turks", *Speculum*, vol. 45 (1970), 380; idem, *Constantinople*, 234-37, 267-75; for Venetian blockade of Pera as a retaliation of the attacks of the Genoese Corsairs in 1328 see Heyd, I, 485; Laiou, *Ibid.*, 301.

From 1318 on, cooperation between the Catalans under Don Alfonso Fadrique (vicar general 1317-1330) and the Anatolian Turks of Aydın and Monteshe, enabled the latter to extend their field of action against the Venetians as far as Euboea and Crete.²⁷ The Catalan-Turkish cooperation was particularly damaging to Venetian interests on Euboea. The Turks, in their incursions in 1326, spared the lands of Fadrique on the island, and when their ships were seized, took refuge there and returned to Anatolia on his ships.²⁸ M. Sanudo Torsello, a contemporary of the events, speaks of a powerful Turkish fleet consisting of six galleys and thirty smaller ships threatening Euboea in 1327. Again in the winter of 1327, Turks came in seven ships and pillaged the island of Aegina and Latin territories in the Morea. These incursions benefited Fadrique who had his own plans to invade Euboea. At this time the Turks who raided the island were chiefly interested in enslaving the inhabitants for sale in Anatolia,³⁰ which in the long run seriously affected the cultivation of the land and rate of income of the Latin feudatories.

²⁷ D. Jacoby, "Catalans, Turcs et Venetiens en Romanie", *Studi Medievali*, series III, vol. 15 (1974), 247; K. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens*, London 1975, 27,34; E.A. Zachariadou, "The Catalans of Athens and the Beginning of the Turkish Expansion in the Aegean Area", *Studi Medievali*, ser. III, vol. 21, fasc. 2 (1980), 821-838, states that Aydın-Catalan alliance goes back to 1304.

²⁸ Jacoby, *op.cit.*, 252.

²⁹ *Ibid.* 253-4.

³⁰ Jacoby, p. 253. A great number of Greeks from Turkey were sold as slaves in Crete in 1363: see F. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du sénat de Venise*, I, Paris 1958, 410; one of the reasons for the shift in population of the islands was the oppression of the Latin feudatories, and some of the Greek villeins even chose to go to Turkish lands in Anatolia, apparently upon obtaining *aman*, amnesty guarantees. In addition, the plague of 1348 disastrously aggravated the situation: see Thiriet, *op. cit.*, I, nos. 210, 214.

First contacts among the Christian nations for a league against the Turks in the Aegean had begun under Venice's initiative as early as 1327, but it was not until 1332 that serious negotiations began when Umur conducted raids into Byzantine and Venetian possessions in the Aegean.³¹ At the start these negotiations included all the Christian nations in the Aegean area including the Byzantines and Martino Zaccaria.

The first step Venice had taken had been to conclude a truce with Andronicus in October 1324. Until then Venice had expected to recover her position in the Levant through the restoration of a Latin empire in Constantinople. Andronicus II, meanwhile, had adhered to an anti-Venetian policy mirroring the feelings of his subjects, consequently becoming increasingly dependent on Genoese support.³² In 1322, however, Byzantine diplomacy began to take a completely different track. Aware of their overdependence on the Genoese and the growing Turkish danger, they resumed the policy of neutralizing the West through the Unionist approach.³³

The new Byzantine Emperor, Andronicus III (1328-1341) was determined to restore Byzantine rule in the Eastern Aegean and push back the Turkish advance. It should be remembered that he fought the battle of Pelekanon against the Ottomans on 10 May, 1329, and saw reconciliation and alliance with Western Christendom as indispensable. For Venice, an Aegean League including Byzantium was considered such a necessity that, with diplomatic efforts, she finally convinced the Papal and French courts not to insist on the Latin restoration and the Union for the moment. As Sanudo Torsello tried to present it, the Turkish threat in the Ae-

³¹ A. Laiou, "Marino Sanudo Torsello, Byzantium and the Turks: the Background to the Anti-Turkish League of 1332-1334", *Speculum*, 45 (1970), 374-92.

³² A. Laiou, *Constantinople*, 200-83.

³³ The Emperor, though under the pressure of intensely anti-Latin public opinion, was forced to drop anti-unionist policy in 1327: Laiou, *ibid.*

³⁴ R. Lopez, *Genova Marinara nel Duecento: Benedetto Zaccaria Ammiraglio e mercante*, Messina-Milano, 1933.

gean posed the first and most urgent problem to be solved by a general crusade. In effect, Venice formulated a new policy to mobilize Western Christendom for its own interests in the Eastern Mediterranean and replaced the "schismatic" Byzantines there with the Turks. This formula re-oriented its Levant policy in a completely new direction.

By 1317 Zaccarias³⁴ were considered the most effective power against the Turks, blocking their access to the sea through the possession of Chios and the castle at Smyrna, and, as such, their cooperation in any crusading plan was thought to be of crucial importance. The Dominican friar, Adam of Guillaume, in his plan for a crusade, suggested that crusaders occupy the peninsula of Aerythrea (Çeşme), which, together with Chios would make an excellent base for the reconquest of Anatolia.³⁵ Philip of Taranto, planning for restoration of the Latin empire in Constantinople, recognized Martino Zaccaria as "king and despot of Asia Minor" with the islands of Lesbos, Samos, Kos, Tenedos, Icaria, Oenoufsai and Marmara.³⁶

The crushing defeat of the fleet of Aydın-ili by the allied Genoese and Rhodian fleets off Chios (July 23, 1319), seems to have been only a temporary setback for the Turks. The Smyrna castle, strongly garrisoned, resisted for two and a half years before Martino Zaccaria surrendered it to Umur Beg.³⁷ However, Marti-

³⁵ A.S. Atiya, *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, London 1938, 65-6. C. Dukas Limpidares, in a letter to Charles of Valois, promised the cooperation of native Greeks in the liberation of western Asia Minor from the Turkish invasion: see U.V. Bosch, *Andronikos II Palaiologos*, 147, note 6.

³⁶ A. Laiou, *Constantinople*, 319.

³⁷ See P. Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 54-8; the Turkish conquest must certainly be before the Byzantine expedition to Chios in autumn 1329. Under the Lascarids Smyrna was the main port city of the empire in the Mediterranean and its navel base. Later on under the Palaeologi the Genoese were granted important administrative and fiscal privileges in Smyrna (Treaty of Nymphaion, 1261) and its ties with Byzantium slackened. Smyrna was besieged by the Turks in 1300. The fortress of Smyrna up the hill, Palaion-Kastron, was taken by Mehmed Beg, father of Umur, in 1317 from the Genoese: see H. Ahrweiler, "L'histoire et Géographie de la région de Smyrna entre les deux occupations turques (1081-1317)", *Travaux et Mémoires, Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilization Byzantines*, I, Paris 1965, 1-204.

no, the *Destan* notes, was feasted (toylama) by Umur and then left for Chios, "which became *illik*, a place for him to stay". Lemerle suggested³⁸ that Martino, threatened in Chios by the machinations of Andronicus III, the energetic new emperor who was determined to restore Byzantine rule in the Eastern Aegean,³⁹ thought it necessary to evacuate Smyrna and to bring its garrison to reinforce Chios. But there was something more to this move since Chios under Martino now became *illik*, that is, in the terminology of the frontier Turks, "a part of the Dar al-Islam", as opposed to *yagılık*. Its defence was now a duty incumbent upon Muslims. In other words Martino now chose Umur's alliance and protection.⁴⁰ This explains why after 1329 Umur entered into hostilities with the Byzantines, attacking them on Chios which had been put under direct Byzantine rule following the defeat and capture of Martino,⁴¹ and in subsequent years mounting expeditions against Gallipoli and

³⁸ *Op.cit.*, 57.

³⁹ For Andronicus' expedition see Bosch, *op.cit.*, 113-116.

⁴⁰ Lemerle, *op.cit.*, 48-50, misinterpreted Umur's relations with Martino and Byzantium for this period. In couplet 144 the expression *illik oldu* is translated by Mélikoff (p. 51) as *la paix conclue*. It means actually for a land to come under Islamic sovereignty. It corresponds to the Arabic term *dar al-Islam* as opposed to *dar al-harb*, see "Dār al-'ahd", *EP*, 116; also see M. Khadduri, *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*, Baltimore 1960, 155-74; a contemporary source, Ahmed Aflaki, *Manakib al-'Arifin*, ed. T. Yazıcı, Ankara 1961, II, 950 said: "Umur Pasha moved against Sakız-Adası (Chios) and conquered it. They took so much mastic (as booty) that no one can tell. Umur Pasha submitted the island to tribute (*kharadj*) and made it his own source of income (*khassa*)". Export of mastic, much in demand in Islamic countries, brought a large revenue, hence the Byzantine concern to maintain its control of the island. Sale of it brought to the *Mahonesi* a revenue of 10,068 gold ducats in 1379, and 6732 in 1498; see Ph. Argenti, *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese*, Cambridge 1958, 125, 268, 385.

⁴¹ Lemerle, *op.cit.*, 54-58. He maintains that the statement in the *Destan* on Umur's attack on Chios at this time may be a confusion with the Turkish attack of 1304. Umur's attack is dated by Lemerle, 59-62, at the end of 1329 or early 1330.

Thrace (1331) and Greek territories in the Morea (1332). The *Destan* clearly states⁴² that hostilities between the Byzantines and Umur continued even after the Emperor concluded an agreement with Mehmed Beg, Umur's father, in the fall of 1329. According to Cantacuzenus,⁴³ Mehmed promised, apparently upon the pledge of a yearly tribute, not to attack the emperor's territory.

In fact, Umur acted independently, waging war against the Greeks, in alliance with the son of Sarukhan who, like Umur, was in charge of the frontier region. Umur argued that it was against the orders of God to prevent the ghaza, Islamic Holy War.⁴⁴ This kind of tension was to be seen in the Ottoman state between Orkhan and his son Süleyman and later on between the frontier (udj) lords and the central government. Furthermore, Umur was informed, obviously through his Greek agents, about the preparations for a crusade among the Christian nations, and must have been well aware of the Emperor's involvement in the negotiations for a league against the Turks.

⁴² Turkish text 25; Mélikoff, verses: 376-90.

⁴³ Lemerle, 67; Bosch, 159, but confusing Sarukhan's territory with Mehmed's.

⁴⁴ The *Destan*, Mélikoff, verses: 382-86. Lemerle, 61, 67, has drawn attention to the disagreement between Mehmed and Umur. However, I cannot share his opinion that this caused a great deal of tension between the two, and resulted in Hızır's disagreement with his brother. That Hızır did not participate personally but sent his ships to the expedition against Chios in 1330 was quite normal. Afterwards he came back to Smyrna to take his share of the booty. As to the fact that Mehmed Beg sent a mentor to his son to persuade him to give up the expedition against Gallipoli, the *Destan* gives the impression rather that Mehmed thought it too dangerous. After his return from the aborted expedition, perfect harmony was restored between them. The next year Umur fought the Greeks in the Morea. Here again I think the erudite Byzantinist has tried too hard to find evidence in the text that Umur's soldiers were unwilling to fight the Greeks because of the existence of an agreement. Lemerle's method seems to me not entirely consistent, for while most of the time he relies on the *Destan* as a *detailed, well-informed and excellent* source, he is inclined to dismiss it or force interpretations from it whenever it might be in contradiction with his own hypotheses. Ibn Battuta, *The Travels*, II, trans. H.A.R. Gibb, Cambridge 1966, 446, who visited Smyrna about this time presents Umur as a prince "continually in *djihad* (Holy War). He had war galleys with which he used to make raids on the *environs of Constantinople the Great*."

In contradiction to his father's policy of reconciliation with the emperor, Umur, in alliance with the sea ghazis of Sarukhan, attacked the Greeks at Gallipoli and on the island of Samothrace, and landed in Thrace at Porou (1331 or 1332). In 1332 in his expeditions against Euboea and Bodonitsa in Thessaly, Umur joined Turks from Western Anatolia in raiding Venetian possessions in the Western Aegean. It is interesting to note that Byzantium joined the *liga* against the Turkish *ghazi* princes, for which purpose Venice had opened negotiations with Byzantium as early as July 1332. The powerful fleet (40 galleys) of this first anti-Turkish league in the Aegean, in which Venice, Rhodes, Cyprus, Byzantium, the Pope, and the King of France took part,⁴⁵ destroyed the fleet (250 vessels) of Shudja' al-Din Yakhshi-Khan, *emir* of Bergama,⁴⁶ of the principality of Karasi, in the bay of Adramyttion in September 1334. The *Destan* relates how the Christian fleet made several attempts at landing in Smyrna which were repulsed by Turkish archers.⁴⁷

In 1334 Umur succeeded his father in Birgi as Ulu-Beg, supreme ruler of Aydın-ili, marking a turning point in his career and putting directly under his command for the holy war all the forces of the principality. As a *ghazi* he felt his first duty to submit Philadelphia (Alaşehir), a Greek city in the interior near his capital. He lifted the siege of the city when it agreed by treaty to pay *kharadj*, tribute. Meanwhile, Byzantine diplomacy at this time had changed, seeking an alliance with the Turks against the Latins in the Aegean, a change obviously introduced by the shrewd "Domestikos"

⁴⁵ In the *Destan* Mélikoff: verses 835-38, each of them supplied ten ships while according to Western sources Rhodes 10, Cyprus 10, and the Emperor 6: see Lemerle, 98.

⁴⁶ Yakhshi-Khan, son of the beg of Karasi, was at the head of the sea *sandjak* of the principality, a position similar to that of Umur in Smyrna.

⁴⁷ The *Destan*, verses: 835-50. Lemerle, 100, thinks this attack took place at the end of 1334.

John Cantacuzenus and maintained by him until the end of his career as the cornerstone of his policies. In the face of the constant Genoese threat against Chios and the recent occupation of Mytilene by Domenico Cattaneo, seigneur of Phocaea, the Byzantine government sought a reconciliation with Umur. Andronicus III met with Umur and his brother Hızır, who had accompanied him for the occasion, near the Çeşme (Aerythrea) peninsula, to negotiate. The Emperor offered Umur a large sum of money (100,000 gold pieces in the *Destan*) to come to an agreement. The *Destan* is clear on the points discussed in the course of the negotiations: Umur rejected the offer and insisted on payment of an annual tribute for Chios and Philadelphia. In return, he said he was ready to guarantee a general peace with the Greeks and military aid against the enemies of the Empire. The Emperor finally agreed "to bestow Chios" as the *Destan* puts it, to Umur, which in actuality meant submission and payment of the annual *mal-i kharadj*,⁴⁸ or tribute money, thus, according to Islamic law, making the island part of Islamic territory. For the emperor this guaranteed protection of the island by Umur against any Latin intervention.⁴⁹ The agreement was "ratified by oath". Thus, the problem of Chios, Umur's main concern since Martino Zaccaria was removed by the

⁴⁸ Verses 1025-1026; Lemerle's interpretation of the expression *malın alup* is inaccurate (p. 106). It meant: Umur accepted and received *kharadj*. *Mal-i Kharadj* or simply *mal* is widely used in this sense in Turkish during the 14th and 15th centuries. Philadelphia was under the protection of the Germiyan principality paying *kharadj* since at least 1314, see Himmet Akın, *Aydın Ogulları*, Istanbul 1946, 40; cf. P. Schreiner, "Zur Geschichte Philadelphias im 14 Jahrh.", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, vol. 35 (1969), 385-401. Because of rivalry on Philadelphia relations between Aydın and Germiyan became hostile which explains the attempt of the ruler of Germiyan at establishing friendly relations with the Christian league towards 1333, winter: see F. Thiriet, *op. cit.* I, 31, no. 39. Thiriet's identification of *Carmignano* with *Karaman* is evidently not correct; also see the information supplied by a newly discovered Greek source on Umur's siege of Philadelphia: Matoula Couroupou, "Le siège de Philadelphie par Umur Pacha d'après le manuscrit de la Bibliothèque patriarcale d'Istanbul, Panaghias 58", in H. Ahrweiler, ed., *Geographica byzantina*, Paris 1981, 67-77, and E. Zachariadou's note, *ibid.* 78-80. Walter Kaegi drew my attention to this recent publication.

⁴⁹ Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 114, completely missed the point.

Byzantines, was finally settled. What is more, at the end of the negotiations which were, as the *Destan* suggests, conducted in a very friendly atmosphere, Umur and the emperor "became brothers". Further detail is given by the Greek sources, Gregoras and Cantacuzenus, from whom we know that Umur and Sarukhan-oghlu became allies of the Emperor, and cooperated militarily with him in his efforts to reduce Phocaea to submission and to take back Mytilene from Cattaneo.⁵⁰

For Umur the agreement was an important diplomatic achievement since through it one of the members of the Christian League became his ally and his suzerainty rights over the island of Chios and Philadelphia were now recognized. Threatened as he was by a crusade, it was a logical policy for Umur to restore peace with Byzantium.

As for the Byzantines, the alliance with Umur, providing as it did valuable military aid, became an instrument of Andronicus III's policy of restoration of Byzantine sovereignty throughout the empire, not only in the Aegean but also in such distant provinces as Acarnania and Albania. It was unfortunate for the Byzantines that they should plunge into a civil war after the death of Andronicus III (1341), and, that Cantacuzenus should use the aid supplied by his "faithful friend", Umur during the course of the civil war for himself.

⁵⁰ See Lemerle, 110-113. For Sarukhan-oghlu's alliance, necessary for Phocaea, see, *ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

Umur was on the way to creating a Muslim empire in the Aegean, making local Christian governments his tributaries or his allies. The information given in the *Destan* on these relations are often dismissed or misinterpreted in Lemerle's book. We should keep in mind here that while the Christians considered the annual tribute as an insignificant sacrifice in return for the eschewal of the recurrent Turkish raids, the Muslims saw the *kharadj* payment as equivalent to submission to the Muslim state and making it a part of the *Dar al-Islam*.⁵¹ While his alliance with the Catalans had facilitated his expeditions to Greece, his alliance with the Byzantines opened for him the whole Balkan region, since he could now leave his ships in friendly territory with confidence; for they would be protected while he made his prolonged raids into the interior. Furthermore, because of the rivalries between the Christian governments in the area, especially between Venice and the Catalans and between Genoa and the Byzantines, it was possible for Umur to undo attempts of Venice and the Papacy to maintain a common front.

With his military power growing as a result of the *azebs* now flocking to his flag,⁵² Umur benefitted from his alliance with Cantacuzenus to become a decisive force in the Balkans between 1341 and 1345. It is true that, content with finding employment and booty for his *ghazis*, he did not seek territorial gains. Nevertheless, he played a crucial role in the Balkans,⁵³ first in checking the Bulga-

⁵¹ That the *Destan* stresses the dependent position of the Byzantine Emperor is not without interest, see verses: 1055-1070.

⁵² In 1342 his army which landed in Thrace numbered 20,000: see Lemerle, p. 150; in the *Destan* it is 15,000, but his regular forces seem to be no more than 6000. For the growth of his fleet and army see *infra*.

⁵³ It is to be remembered that the Ottoman conquest followed the same methods in its initial phase.

rians in their moves against the Byzantines in 1341, and then, upon the death of Andronicus III (1341) and the outbreak of civil war in Byzantium, in supporting Cantacuzenus against his rivals in Constantinople.⁵⁴ It is worth mentioning that his unwavering support of "his friend" Cantacuzenus, so crucial in the latter's struggles against his rivals in the capital and the Bulgarians and Serbs outside, was ultimately designed to ensure the defeat of the pro-Latin and pro-Rome government in Constantinople.⁵⁵

In 1343 envoys from Constantinople were in Italy urging the formation of a crusade against Umu, the chief supporter of which since 1341 had been Venice, which was hard-pressed at Euboea and the Cyclades by Turkish raders.⁵⁶ At the same time negotiations for the union of Churches were actively resumed between Byzantium and the Pope. Basic to any understanding of the real issues in the Aegean at this period, it must be added that Venice, a power claiming domination on the sea, was seriously considering displacing the Genoese at Phocaea and Chios.⁵⁷ Venice was concerned about the possibility that Chios might fall into the hands of its enemies.⁵⁸ Lastly, while Cantacuzenus' Byzantine rivals were favoring the idea of cooperation with Stephan Dushan, Venice was suspicious of the latter's plans for the conquest of Constantinople.⁵⁹

As a measure of the Turkish power in the Aegean it is interesting

⁵⁴ For these developments now see Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 144-229.

⁵⁵ It is rather naive to take at face value the statements of Cantacuzenus asserting that Umu's behavior toward him was motivated simply by his faithfulness to him. cf. Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 145-77.

⁵⁶ Thiriet, I, nos. 92, 93, 96, 115, 142, 147, 149, 160.

⁵⁷ See Thiriet, nos. 171, 182.

⁵⁸ See Lemerle, 187, note 3.

⁵⁹ Thiriet, no. 189.

to note that for the crusade, Venice now planned a fleet of 30 galleys, each carrying 200 soldiers.⁶⁰ Umur at the time was in Aydin-eli. Cantacuzenus tried in vain to inform him about the attack of the crusading fleet, but it was already too late as the crusading fleet of twenty galleys, supplied by the Pope, Venice, and the King of Cyprus and the Hospitallers, had made a surprise attack on the castle in the port at Smyrna and captured it and the port on October 28, 1344.⁶¹

The Pope saw the occupation of the port of Symrna as the beginning of further Christian advances against the Turks.⁶² For a brief moment the Christian successes generated universal enthusiasm in the West "reminiscent of the time of the great European Crusades."⁶³ It turned out to be a passing fervor, however, shared only by the remnants of medieval chivalry, as characterized in the person of the French dauphin, Humbert, whose crusade in 1345 ended rather pitifully. The Pope was powerless to put a stop to the conflicts between the major powers of Europe, France and England on the one hand, and Hungary and Venice on the other. The important consequence of the crusades of 1344 and 1345 was to highlight the Turkish threat to Europe, and to make Turkish advances to the West the chief concern of the later crusades.⁶⁴ For Umur, the occupation by the crusaders of *Smyrna inferiores*, that is both castle and port, as well as the destruction of his naval base there,⁶⁵ made

⁶⁰ Thiriet, no. 142.

⁶¹ For the event see Delaville Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes*, 92-95; P. Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 180-203; K. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant*, I, Philadelphia 1976, 191-93.

⁶² In his letter to Humbert of Viennois: see Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 189, note 4.

⁶³ N. Iorga, *Philippe de Mezières, 1327-1405, et la croisade au XIV^e siècle*, Paris 1896, 43-44.

⁶⁴ See Iorga, *op. cit.*, 42-46; A.S. Atiya, *op. cit.*, 301-302; and Setton, *op. cit.*, 223.

⁶⁵ For the burning of Umur's ships see Cantacuzenus cited by Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 190; Iorga, *op. cit.*, 42.

it impossible for him to continue his overseas expeditions. Now, and only with the cooperation of the principalities of Sarukhan and Karasi, Umur had to go overland to the Dardanelles and pass from there to Thrace across the straits.⁶⁶

The fall of Smyrna seems to have had extensive repercussions in the Islamic world. Ibn Battuta,⁶⁷ who visited Aydın principality in 1331 or 1332, speaks of the fall of the Smyrna castle (28 October, 1344) and the death of Umur (May 1348), events of which he presumably heard later during his return journey through Syria in 1348. Eretna, the powerful emir of Central Anatolia, had sent Umur two experts in making catapults with which to batter away the walls of the castle now in Christian hands.⁶⁸ Later on in 1402 when Timur captured Smyrna he apparently wanted to present himself as the only Muslim ruler capable of protecting the Muslim world against the Crusaders.⁶⁹

Even though it did not prove to be a bridgehead for further attacks by the crusaders,⁷⁰ the occupation of *Smyrna inferiores* was a blow to Umur's image as the champion of *ghaza* in the Islamic world. His end while besieging the Smyrna castle in May 1348 is

⁶⁶ The *Destan*, Mélikoff, verses: 2277-2365, confirms Cantacuzenus, see Lemerle,

4-17.

⁶⁷ *The Travels of Ibn Battuta*, 447; in his letter to the Pope, Hughes IV, king of Cyprus claimed that the Sultan of Egypt, hearing of the fall of Smyrna, declared that he would destroy all Christian princes: see Iorga, *op.cit.*, 45.

⁶⁸ The *Destan*, verses: 2091-2094.

⁶⁹ See Nizameddīn Shāmī, *Zafernâme*, ed. F. Tauer, Prag 1956, Text: 421-22; notes, p. 179: "Of the Muslim rulers of Anatolia no one had been able to conquer it".

⁷⁰ For the difficulties for the Pope to find even the necessary funds to maintain Christian garrison there see, Setton, *op. cit.*, 220-23.

described in the *Destan* as a martyr's death. Long after, he was remembered by Ottoman *ghazis* as the first conqueror of the Balkans and was considered as the spiritual leader of the *ghaza* in Rumeli.⁷¹

One of the consequences of the fall of Smyrna in 1344 was that Byzantine Chios, until then under Umur's protection, was now at the mercy of the Latins. In 1346 Humbert II of Viennois, "the captain general of the Christian army against the Turks," sought the consent of the Byzantine government in Constantinople to occupy it as a base for military operations, but the Genoese fleet, under the admiral Simone Vignoso, made a surprise attack and captured the whole island first (June 15 - September 12, 1346). Genoese control was soon also reestablished in the old Genoese colonies on the mainland of Old and New Phocaeas.⁷² A further success in curbing the activities of Turkish *ghazis* in the Aegean was the defeat by a Christian navy of an allied fleet from the Turkish maritime states near the island of Imbros in the spring of 1347.⁷³

⁷¹ See *Düsturname-i Enveri*, ed. M. Halil, Istanbul 1929, Text: 83.

⁷² Setton, *op. cit.*, 206-7; P. Argenti, *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese*, 86-124; Byzantine government had to recognize the Genoese rule over the island in return for an annual tribute of 500 hyperpers in 1363: see, W. Heyd, *op. cit.*, I, 502. In reaction to the Byzantine plans to restore their naval power and sovereignty in eastern Aegean and Pera the Genoese passed to the offensive. Following their successes against Chios and two Phocaeas they extended the territory of Pera and surrounded it with strong walls (see W. Heyd, *op. cit.*, I, 499). Venice then began to consider an attack against its rival. Already in May 1348 Giustiniano Giustinian, captain of the Venetian squadron in the coalition fleet, was ordered to go to protect Venetian merchant ships in the Levant (Thiriet, *op. cit.*, I, no. 211). Soon afterwards Venice withdrew all his ships from the Christian fleet in view of a war against the Genoese.

⁷³ Lemerle, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

Then, Hızır, the new ruler of Aydın-ili, by offering peace tried to prevent a renewed attack of crusaders. Disappointed in its efforts to conclude a final peace treaty, and, thus to see the end of the Christian coalition, the first Turkish embassy to appear at a papal court returned empty handed.⁷⁴ The preliminary agreement concluded in August, 18, 1348 in either Smyrna or Ephesus now became void, and the Pope led the allies to join in a new league against the Turks in January, 1351. Hızır had become aggressive allowing his sea *ghazis* to raid Venetian possessions in the Aegean, and preparing land and sea forces for an attack upon Christian Smyrna.⁷⁵ Furthermore, by granting capitulations to the Genoese who were at war with the Venetians, he made for himself a new Christian ally.⁷⁶ Indeed, the granting of capitulations (*ahdname* or *shurut*) to a Christian state signified more than a simple agreement of guarantees for trade and for merchants. On the part of the Muslim state, the capitulations signified principally that it recog-

⁷⁴ Ambassador's name as rendered *Essedin Balaban* must be 'Izz al-Din Balaban; about this time, a certain *Balaban* of Genoa informed Al-'Umari about the principalities in Western Anatolia; he was apparently a Genoese convert and probably the same as Essedin Balaban. For this embassy see J. Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient*, Paris 1904, 89; and now, Setton, *The Papacy*, 216-220.

⁷⁵ Andrea Dandolo's letter, dated October 7, 1350, cited by Lemerle, *op. cit.* 234.

⁷⁶ Instructions to the Genoese ambassadors dated, May 26, 1351: see Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 232; E. Zachariadou, "Sept traités inédits entre Venise et les émirats d'Aydın et de Menteşe, 1331-1407", *Studi Preottomani e Ottomani, Atti del Convegno di Napoli*, 1974, 1976, 237. Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 233, using the instructions given to the ambassadors of Genoa showed that the date of the agreement was sometime after the spring 1351. The ambassadors should go to "ad altum locum (Alto Luogo, Ephesus) qui ille ominus Ihalabi." Melek Delilbaşı, "Türk Hükümdarlarına Ait Yunanca Ahidnâmeler ve Nâmeler", Thesis, Dil ve Tarih, Coğrafya Fakültesi, Ankara, 1980, 62-67, suggests that the treaty was made between 1346-1348 with the Genoese of Chios. According to this document the Genoese promised to pay a tribute; in return Hızır should give military aid whenever requested. In the treaty (provision 20) concluded in 1403 between the Ottoman Sultan Süleyman I and the Christian league, a reference is made to the tribute of 500 ducats paid yearly to the lord of Alto Luogo: see G.T. Dennis, "The Byzantine-Turkish Treaty of 1403", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 33 (1967), 80; also see F. Thiriet, "Les relations entre la Crète et les émirats turcs d'Asie Mineure au XIV^e siècle (1348-1360)", *Actes du XII^e Congrès Internl. des Études Byzantines*, II, Beograd 1964, 217.

nized the grantee as a friendly nation and that possibilities for other kinds of cooperation existed.⁷⁷

In the end, Hızır's goal of neutralizing the Christian coalition was realized when the Pope, observing that Venice had withdrawn from taking any part in the defense of Smyrna, notified the Grand Master of the Hospitallers in September 1351 of the dissolution of the league. Before long, Venice had established friendly relations with Hızır, who allowed the Venetian-Catalan fleet to pass the winter of 1351-1352 at Ephesus, and began to negotiate a trade agreement with the Duke of Crete (June 20, 1353).⁷⁸

Despite the Latin presence at Smyrna, the Turkish maritime principalities continued their raiding activity in the Aegean during the period 1353-1390. Renewing their traditional alliance with the Catalans of Athens, these Turks again appeared to be active, especially after 1360, the year of the Ottoman onslaught into Thrace. Western sources tell us how in 1359 or 1360 a large Turkish fleet, apparently from Aydın, appeared off the coast of Megara which suffered a serious defeat at the hands of the allied Christian fleet of Venetians, Hospitallers, the Despot of the Morea and the bailie of Achaea. The Turkish survivors took refuge with the Catalans in Thebes.⁷⁹ Again in 1363 the seaborne Turks from Anatolia arrived in Thebes at the invitation of their ally Roger de Lluria, vicar-general of the Catalans, threatened the principality of Achaea, and cooperated with him in overwhelming the forces sent by the Aragonese king. This is probably the same group of Turks who is said to have attacked the island of Amorgos, a possession of the Venetians, in that very same year. At any rate, the Pope, alarmed by the presence of these Turks in Greece, urged the local Latin rulers in 1364 to form a united front.⁸⁰ Venice had been endeavoring since

⁷⁷ See "İmtiyazat" (H. Inalcik), *EI*², IV, 1179.

⁷⁸ M. Villani cited by Heyd, I, p. 543, note 4; now see Zachariadou, *op. cit.* 237; negotiations took about two years between 1351 and 1353. Hızır did not agree to turn against the Genoese: see, Thiriet, *op.cit.*, 218.

⁷⁹ Setton, ed., *The Crusades*, III, 204.

⁸⁰ Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, p.107, no. 412; Setton, *op. cit.*, 457-59.

1362 to bring about a great coalition against the Ottomans that would include Byzantium, Bulgaria, the emperor of Trebizond, Cyprus, the Hospitallers, and even the Genoese. Venice aspired to lead this small crusade and claimed possession of the island of Tenedos, but this sufficed to cause the Genoese to become totally alienated from participation in it. On the other side, the Greek insurrection in Crete in 1363, and the general restlessness of the Greek peasants, heavily exploited in other Venetian possessions of the Aegean, led to the eventual estrangement of Venice and Byzantium. Under the circumstances, Venice abandoned the idea of an anti-Turkish coalition and "in order to be relieved from the heavy burden of defense" chose to follow a conciliatory policy with the Ottoman sultan⁸¹. Furthermore, the Republic showed mistrust of Amadeo VI of Savoy's preparations for a crusade against the Ottomans at this time since the Genoese ships were to join the crusade and the Venetian designs for Tenedos might be jeopardized.

Between 1330 and 1337, while Umur was making his spectacular sea expeditions from Smyrna, the Ottomans, fighting against the Byzantines in Northwest Asia Minor, were also making important conquests (Nicaea, March 2, 1330; Nicomedia, 1337). Their most significant advances had come during the period 1329-1334, when Umur was engaged in hostilities with the Byzantines as well. Though our sources give no hint of an alliance or actual cooperation between Umur and Orkhan in this period, circumstances made them natural allies in this and in the following period, 1342-1346, when Umur gave his strong support to Cantacuzenus against his rivals in Constantinople.⁸² The efforts of the latter to secure military aid from Orkhan failed; instead, with the cooperation of Otto-

⁸¹ Iorga, *Philippe de Mezières*, 202-72; Thiriet, *op.cit.*, 109; Setton, *op. cit.*, 249-57.

⁸² For this period see P. Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 145-74, 204-17.

man troops, Cantacuzenus was able to sever all the Black Sea ports except Sozopolis from the hands of his enemies. The marriage of his daughter, Theodora, to Orkhan (June, 1346) cemented Cantacuzenus' alliance with the Ottoman principality, the strongest of the Turcoman states. Once in full power in Constantinople (February 3, 1347), however, Cantacuzenus turned or at least appeared to turn to a policy of cooptation with the Latins against the Turks, offering to continue the Byzantine alliance with the Pope and Humbert in 1348.⁸³ Cantacuzenus' new policy was actually intended primarily to thwart the plans of Stephan Dushan, Serbian King. Dushan was seeking Venetian cooperation for the conquest of Constantinople.⁸⁴ Under the circumstances, Cantacuzenus had to maintain close relations with the Ottomans, the only source from which he could expect substantial military aid. It was this situation that prepared for the Turkish settlement in Europe.

While the Turks of Aydın-ili were effectively neutralized by the capture of the castle at Smyrna, which the Pope had decided to keep as a check upon them, the Ottoman Turks were becoming more and more involved in Balkan affairs, especially after they had firmly established themselves in Karasi-ili facing Thrace.⁸⁵

⁸³ See R.-J. Loenertz, "Ambassades grecs auprès du Pape Clément VI (1348)", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, XIX (1953), 178-96; Lemerle, 224-26; K. Setton, *op. cit.*, 212-15.

⁸⁴ K. Jireček, *Geschichte der Serben*, I, Gotha, 1911, pp. 386-87, 396; Thiriet, *op. cit.*, no. 189.

⁸⁵ Lemerle, 219-22. The area of Bergama and Troy facing the Dardanelles appears to have been organized as a frontier *sandjak* under a branch of the Karasi dynasty, first under Yakhshi Khan and then under Süleyman Beg.



Organization of Umur's Navy and Army and His Expansion Policy

In the first part of this paper is an outline of Umur's political activities by which he built up his power from 1330 to 1344. This power was based on the influx and engagement of Turcoman forces in overseas expeditions. In other words a navy serving his overseas raiding was the key to the spectacular growth of his power in the Aegean which eventually brought about the shift of the crusades from Syria and Egypt to the Aegean. Again the *Destan* provides us with a first hand description of Umur's navy. Being the earliest and most detailed source on the forces of a *ghazi* principality this description can be a key to understanding how the *ghazi* principalities in western Anatolia, including that of the Ottomans, rose to power.

Already Umur's father, Mehmed Beg, had a rather strong fleet based at Ephesus by 1319 as is disclosed in a report from Rhodes to Pope John XXII: it included ten war galleys and about eighteen smaller ships.⁸⁶ As was seen earlier, this fleet was destroyed by an allied fleet of the Genoese and Hospitallers on July 23, 1319.

⁸⁶ See letter of A. de Schwarzburg to Pope John XXII, dated September 3, 1319 in D. Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers*, 365-67.

After the capture of Smyrna, Umur's navy which was based there exhibited spectacular growth in its size within only a short period, and in the years 1330-1334 it became a major power in the Aegean world. In 1330 for the first major overseas expedition against the Byzantines, Umur mustered a fleet consisting of 7 galleys, 14 *kayık* and 7 *igribar* (for types of ships *infra*). Joining him on this expedition was his brother Hızır of Ayasoluk (Ephesus), whose fleet numbered 22 ships, all *kayıks* or *igribars*. The rich booty collected during this successful attack was divided between the two brothers and their Turcoman *ghazis*.⁸⁷ In the subsequent large scale expeditions against Morea, Bodonitsa (Mundenitsa) and Euboea in 1332 Umur's fleet had grown to 250 ships. It was 170 in the expedition against Greece in 1333, 270 in that against Morea in 1335, 350 in his expedition to the mouth of the Danube in 1341, and 300 in his expedition to Thrace to aid John Cantacuzenus in 1343.⁸⁸

However, flotillas of other ghazi begs, that of his brother Hızır at Ephesus, that of Orkhan, from Menteshe, and especially those of Timur-khan and of Süleyman, princes of the Sarukhan and Karasi principalities north of Umur Beg's territory, must have joined with him on his several major expeditions.⁸⁹ These princes, who had

⁸⁷ The *Destan*, Text, ed. M. Halil, p. 22; Mélikoff, verses: 250-55; Lemerle, 58-61, cf. my note 41.

⁸⁸ The date of the Gallipoli expedition may be 1331 or 1332: see Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 63-74. I prefer the date 1333 for the expedition to Greece since in the *Destan* its account occurs just before that of the death of Mehmed Beg which took place on January 9, 1334. As to the number of ships, the figures in these expeditions are partly confirmed in Byzantine or Western sources: by 1332, 72 ships in Cantacuzenus, in 1342, 200 in the same source, 300 in Gregoras, see Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 52, 72, 82; cf. D. Le Roulx, *op. cit.*, p.92.

⁸⁹ Perhaps this can explain why Umur had only 110 ships on his later expedition to Greece. In 1331 or 1332 he planned his daring attack on Gallipoli in a meeting with the princes of Sarukhan and Menteshe. The latter, Orkhan by name, though obviously the prince of Menteshe, is often confused with the Ottoman ruler Orkhan (1326-1362).

appanages on the sea frontier lands were naturally eager like Umur himself,⁹⁰ to distinguish themselves by leading *ghaza* activities on the sea. Urged on by Turcoman warriors eager for booty, these begs of the frontiers in Western Anatolia and later on in the frontier regions of the Ottoman state, often differed with the policies of the central government, which chose to remain faithful to the agreements it had entered into and to encourage peaceful relations with Christian nations, both for the benefit of the trading interests of its subjects and the customs revenues of its treasury. The decision of Umur and the princes of Sarukhan and Monteshe to attack Byzantine Gallipoli was made in spite of the efforts of Umur's father Mehmed Beg to prevent them. Mehmed Beg, ruler of Aydın-ili, had signed a peace agreement with Andronicus III in 1329. By Islamic law such agreements made with the "infidels" were to be observed in good faith, but perpetual *ghaza*, though it might be temporarily deferred under certain conditions, was also a stipulation of Islamic law. The sea *ghazi*s⁹¹ from the coasts of Monteshe (Caria), must have been particularly anxious to join Umur, since the Hospitallers on Rhodes deterred their activities and since the Beg of Monteshe in the interior at Milas as well as the Hospitallers themselves seemed now to be more interested in developing commercial relations profitable for both sides than in engaging in warfare.⁹²

⁹⁰ Umur, the second son of Mehmed Beg, was to become Ulu-Beg, ruler of Aydın-ili, upon his father's death in 1334. For the structure of these principalities, particularly the way in which territory was divided up among members of the dynasty, see Halil Edhem, *Düvel-i Islamiyye*, Istanbul 1927, 272-330; H. İnalcık, "Osmanlılarda Saltanat Verâseti Usûlü", *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, no. 92.

⁹¹ A contemporary Arabic source. *Al-'Umari*, *Masâlik al-Absâr*, 45, calls them *ghuzât fi 'l-bahr*, sea *ghazis*.

⁹² Cf. E. Zachariadou, "Sept traités...", 229-40.

The *Destan* tells us that Umur's ships were built at the Smyrna (Izmir) arsenal under the supervision of a Hodja Selman, a captain and obviously Umur's top advisor in naval operations.^{93a} The types of ships mentioned in Umur's navy are the *kadırga*, *kayık*, and the *igribar*. Also called the *trireme*, *kadırga*, from the Greek *κάρτεγον*, armed war galley^{93b} was the basic warship of Mediterranean navies until the 17th century. A rowing vessel, the galley, which did not usually require special dockyards for its construction, had a shallow draught. Easy maneuverability, speed and invisibility from great distances are features which made it especially useful as a pirate ship.⁹⁴ The strength of a navy was measured by the number of galleys in it. In 1329 Umur had only one galley, but later "a number

^{93a} Hodja Selman seems also to be the principal source for the accounts of Umur Beg's expeditions in the *Destan*, see Text, 57; Mélikoff, verse 1865.

^{93b} H. Kahane and A. Tietze, *The Lingua Franca in the Levant*, Urbana 1958, Index: *Kadırga*; S. Soucek, "Certain Types of Ships in Ottoman-Turkish Terminology", *Turcica*, VII (1975), 234-35; for an Ottoman description of *kadırga* Piri Reis, *Kitab-i Bahriyye*, ed. and trans. P. Kahle, II, p. XXXIV, XXXVII.

⁹⁴ Colin H. Imber, "The Navy of Süleyman the Magnificent", *Archivum Ottomanicum*, VI (1980), 215. As described in Ottoman sources, "a standard galley had twenty-five thwarts on each side and three oarsmen to each thwart." In addition to the oarsmen, totalling about 150, a galley could hold a crew of up to 150. Crowded with such a large crew, a galley had a limited capacity for victuals and water barrels, and had therefore to stay near the shore to continually refurbish its supplies: Imber, *op. cit.*, p. 216; for Venetian galleys see E. Fasano-Guarini, "Comment naviguent les galères", *Annales, Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, XVI (1961), 279-96.

of them". From 1332-34 the number increased rapidly.⁹⁵ The bulk of Umur's navy consisted of smaller swift rowing vessels, *igribar* and *kayık*, well suited to the tactics of his fighting men:⁹⁶ the seizure of merchant ships and raiding along the coastland and islands. They tried to avoid encountering Christian fleets on the high seas. During a raid these light ships were drawn up onto the shore and guarded by a small force of *azeb* while the main body went inland.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ In the projects for crusades drawn up in the first decades of the 14th century, 10-12 galleys were thought enough to clear the Eastern Mediterranean of corsairs: see, Atiya, *Crusades*, 56,120; Mas Latrie, *Histoire de Chypre*, II, 118-25. But during the negotiations with Pope John XXII on the size of an allied Christian fleet to bring against the Turkish sea forces in the Aegean, Venice asserted that a fleet of 24 galleys (Rhodes 4, Venice 10, and Byzantium 10) would be totally inadequate, and that even 40 galleys, as was suggested later in 1334 (Rhodes 10, Venice 10, Byzantium 6, Cyprus 6, and the Pope and the King of France together 8) would not be sufficient. However, during negotiations with the King of France in 1332, Venice had suggested that 20 or 30 armed vessels could neutralize the Turkish sea forces: see Laiou "Marino Sanudo Torsello," 386. In the *Destan*, the Christian navy which attacked Smyrna in 1334 and defeated Yakhshi is described as 30 ships strong; Western sources put the number at 20: see Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 96-98. Evidently Venice must have had in mind the whole allied fleet of the Turkish maritime principalities in the Aegean. For after the destruction of the naval forces of Yakhshi, of the Karasi dynasty, in 1334, the Venetian Senate decided in 1339 that 12 war galleys were sufficient to guard the Gulf and Romania. In one project for a crusade submitted to Pope Clement VI in 1342, the Senate proposed that thirty galleys in good condition would be sufficient. When finally in 1344 the Christian allies attacked and captured the harbor fortress of Smyrna, their fleet numbered 24 galleys.

⁹⁶ For these, see I.H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilâtı*, Ankara 1948, 457,468; Imber, *op. cit.*, 260-69.

⁹⁷ This was a risky operation; on several occasions the Christians siezed the ships left under the guard of a small force, and the raiders returning to the shore found themselves in desperate straits. This happened in 1326 in Euboea, see D. Jacoby "Catalans", *op. cit.*, 251.

Throughout the period of 1330-1344, no mention is made of a sea battle between Umur Beg and the Christians either in the *Destan* or in Western sources, and it is certainly an exaggeration to speak of Turkish control of the Aegean in this period. The Christian victory over the fleet of Yakhshi-Khan in 1334 was a severe lesson for sea *ghazi*s.⁹⁸

The fighting men in Umur's navy, the *azebs*, were essentially the same people as those who filled the ranks of the *ghazi bölüks* (companies) in the interior, motivated by the same hope of making booty a means of livelihood as well as becoming a *ghazi*, warrior for Islam. The word 'azab means in Arabic, unmarried, thence a young man, not settled, looking for job, a wanderer. The term must originally have been used indiscriminately for such men of whatever background, but already in the first half of the 14th century it had become a term used in the maritime provinces specifically to indicate the soldiery organized as a marine corps by the begs.⁹⁹ As was the case later on with the Ottoman navy at Gallipoli, there must have been among them some Greek or Italian or Catalan converts; the *Destan* emphasizes that the *azebs* were all Muslims. Originally volunteers from the common people in quest of *ghaza* and booty, the *azebs* were regimented by the begs into a special military organization. In all the Turkish principalities, including the Ottoman, the *azeb* bore a distinctive red cap called a *çibuk-börk* or a *kızıl-börk* (later on to be the headgear of the heretical Turcomans of Anatolia) differentiating them from the immediate retinue of the *beg*, *nöker*, who wore a white cap, *ak-börk*, a symbol of nobility among Turco-Mongol peoples. Armed with the powerful Turkish bow, well known for the force of its impact, the *azebs* had the

⁹⁸ See Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 89-100.

⁹⁹ Later on *azeb* was replaced in this meaning by the Persian term *Levend* or *levent*, see M. Cezar, *Levendler*, Istanbul 1965.

reputation of being excellent archers, praised as such in Umur's *Destan* as well as in contemporary Western sources.¹⁰⁰ In essence light footmen, the *azebs* of Umur, would mount horses when engaged in raiding.¹⁰¹ Umur's *azebs* were proud to belong to the troops of this famous *ghazi* leader, calling themselves Umurdja Oghlanları, the Young Warriors of Umur, a label that hearkens back to the original spirit of martial brotherhood of the frontier Turcomans.¹⁰² As was the case with Osman Ghazi, founder of the Ottoman state, the charismatic leadership in the frontier warfare was the most essential point for the formation of large-scale *ghazi* forces on the frontier.

Whenever he planned a large-scale expedition, Umur sent special messengers inviting "*ghazi*" to come to Smyrna and take to the sea. As the expeditions proved to be extremely successful, bringing "endless booty in slaves as well as gold, silver and cloths," the invitations would be answered by crowds of *ghazıs* "filling all the hills and plains around Smyrna".¹⁰³ While his army was only 3000 men strong in the expedition to Chios in 1330, transported in 50 ships at an average of 60 men per ship, by 1343 its numbers had

¹⁰⁰ For Turkish bow, see Atiya, *op. cit.*, pp., 81, 82, 108; in 1334 the Crusaders failed in an attempt to land at Smyrna because "wherever they went to land the Turkish soldiery repulsed them with their arrows", see *Destan*, Mélikoff, verses: 843-44, 1947-2125; also see Walter Kaegi, "The Contribution of Archery to the Conquest of Anatolia", *Speculum*, 39 (1964), pp. 96-108.

¹⁰¹ Horses were brought along on the expeditions most probably in separate transport ships (*at-gemisi*): the *Destan*, verses: 490, 1216, 1249-1252.

¹⁰² We shall see that later on in the Ottoman Empire frontier *ghazıs* were named after their respective leaders as *Mihallu*, *Evrenozlu*, *Malkoçlu*, *Turahanlu*, etc. For the *ghazi* companionships, see P. Wittek, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire*, London 1936, 24-29, 34-40; for *nökership* (*comitatus*) see H. Inalcik, "The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy: The Crimean Khanate under Sahib Giray I", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, III-IV (1979-1980), 451-2.

¹⁰³ As in the expedition to Kilia in 1341, see the *Destan*, verses: 1209-1306; Lemerle, *op.cit.*, 129-43.

risen to 15,000 accompanied by an equivalent increase in the number of ships.¹⁰⁴

As for the oarsmen, they appear generally to have been Muslim Turks who had a reputation of being the strongest rowers in the Mediterranean. We know, however, that following his expedition to Chios in 1330, Umur placed one-fifth of the captives, his share of the enslaved, in the ships as oarsmen.¹⁰⁵ The crew in charge of navigation (*komi*, etc.) were mostly Greeks or converts, as was the case with the Ottoman navy later on.¹⁰⁶

Frequent assertions are made in the *Destan* that the Christians were superior in their arms; among those mentioned are the pike (*harbe*), arbalest (*chekre*), cross-bow (*zenberek*), musket (*tüfenk*)

¹⁰⁴ Cantacuzenus gives 29,000 transported on 300 ships and speaks later in 1345 of 20,000 cavalymen: see Lemerle, 150, 206, cf. my note 52.

¹⁰⁵ See the *Destan*, verses: 359-360.

¹⁰⁶ See "Gelibolu", (Inalcik), *EP*², II, 985.

and cannon (*kara-bughra*). The Turks were impressed in particular by the heavy armour of Western soldiery.¹⁰⁷ For their part Umur's soldiery made use of the arbalest and the cross-bow as early as his first expedition in 1329.¹⁰⁸ In 1344, in besieging the castle of Smyrna, which had been captured by the Crusaders, the Turks used stone-hurling catapults.¹⁰⁹ In addition an Arab expert from "the Maghreb" made for them a "strange, small catapult" which destroyed the fortified towers and ships of the Crusaders.¹¹⁰ It is interesting to note that Ereona, the Mongol ruler of central Anato-

¹⁰⁷ It is not, in fact, certain whether these details come from Enverî, who composed in 1464 the part of the *Destan* dealing with Umur's exploits on the basis of an original. The original text he used followed the oral traditions including the accounts of Selman, a companion of Umur. Enverî might have updated his source in his descriptions of the fightings and of the arms used. On the other hand, Lemerle comparing this source with the Latin and Byzantine ones showed that Enverî followed his source faithfully even down to the smallest details. For the Christian arms see especially the chapter in the *Destan* concerning the capture of Smyrna in 1344, Mélikoff, verses: 1866-2108. As for the cannon the *Destan*, verses: 2050-54, says the Christians "fired the *kara-bughra*" and burned down the Turkish tents. This might be a catapult hurling Greek fire. But Greek fire is known in the *Destan* as *naft* or *napht*. However it is certain that the Turks became familiar with firearms towards the end of the fourteenth century. Dubrovnik ships cagling at Ephesus during the last decades of the fourteenth century were armed with bombardes: See, D. Petrović, "Firearms in the Balkans...", *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East*, eds. V. Parry, M. Yapp, London 1975, 177; The word *kara-bughra* is used for cannon in Central Asia in later periods. For the spread of fire arms see A. Angelucci *Documente inediti per la storia delle armi da fuoco italiana*, Turin 1869; Bruno Thomas, *Gesammelte Schriften zur historischen Waffenkunde*, 2vols., reprint Graz 1969. Ottoman Turks became familiar with guns around 1380: Petrović, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

¹⁰⁸ The *Destan*, Mélikoff, verse: 253.

¹⁰⁹ The *Destan*, Mélikoff, verses: 2009-2010.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, verses: 2001-4, 2089-90.

lia, also sent two experts to construct catapults for Umur's siege of the castle. Umur's troops were familiar with the elements of siege warfare such as trench digging and the climbing walls with ladders. It becomes clear that as a result of their cooperation with the Mongols, Byzantines and the Catalans and their confrontations with European soldiery, the frontier Turks appear to have become acquainted with the up-to-date military technology of the time.¹¹¹

In dealing with the history of the *ghazi* principalities of Western Anatolia, we must be sure to take into account the *ghazi* begs' own perception of their power, in order to understand not only how they were able eventually to found well-organized states on the model of Islamic sultanates, but also to see how they dealt with Christian powers, crusaders, or Italian maritime states. Most of the time our western sources, like the modern historians who have only followed them uncritically gave an oversimplified or misleading interpretation of the actions of the *ghazi* states.

It is true that the basic concern of the begs placed on the frontiers was to provide livelihood or booty (*doyum*) for their *ghazis*.¹¹² Thus it was a necessity that booty raids from the frontier areas be organized almost every year, and, after all, Allah had ordered that the *ghaza* be conducted unceasingly on the frontiers of Islamic world so long as this aggressive policy did not endanger the Islamic community. Umur's ready cooperation with the Catalans and later with John V Cantacuzenus can be explained by the fact that they conveniently furnished him with an opportunity to "feed" (*doyurmak*) his *ghazis*.¹¹³ Specifically, this type of coopera-

¹¹¹ Perhaps because it was new to them, the *Destan* gives a detailed description of the tactics of "la petite grenouille" applied by Cantacuzenus during the siege of Peritheorion (Buru) in 1343: See, Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 168.

¹¹² Even the Ottomans, with their well-developed financial resources in the fifteenth century imposed on local populations to support *azebs* to be sent to the imperial army. There is no comprehensive study on the Turkish mercenaries in the service of Christian governments in the fourteenth century; for their importance see S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor*, Berkeley 1971, 134, 182, 234, 403, 404; even in Rhodes the commander of *Turcopouloi* was one of the highest commanders of the Hospitallers.

tion provided him with bases for dangerous operations in distant lands and overseas, where previous raiding parties, lacking refuge amidst a hostile population, had perished.¹¹⁴ If Cantacuzenus claims that it was out of friendship to him that Umur agreed to come whenever he needed help against his rivals, the fact is that most of the time Umur acted like a mercenary chief, and although, unlike many of the others, he was honest and trustworthy, he always demanded an area in which his soldiers would be free to make booty raids. In 1337 when friendly relations were re-established, Andronicus III hired two thousand of Umur's *azebs*, who, having performed admirably for the emperor in Albania, returned home laden with rich booty.¹¹⁵ The taking of *ghanima*, or booty which were fruits of the *ghaza*, Islamic holy war, was much esteemed in Islam; indeed the *ghaza* was the most meritorious way of acquiring property.¹¹⁶ Islamic religious law contained an elaborate chapter on how booty was to be distributed among *ghazis*, one-fifth being set aside as the share of the "Commander of the believers".¹¹⁷ So it is no wonder that after each of Umur's expeditions there is to be

¹¹³ "when he had *fed* his soldiers in those two countries": the *Destan*, Mélikoff, verse: 1117. *Doyurmak* or *doyum olmak* also meant to make booty in the vocabulary of the time.

¹¹⁴ See P. Wittek, "Yazidjioghly 'Ali on the Christian Turks of Dobruja", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 14 (1952), 639-88.

¹¹⁵ See Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 109-113.

¹¹⁶ This is why the Ottoman Sultans preferred to endow pious foundations with the booty from the *ghaza*.

¹¹⁷ See M. Khadduri, *War and Peace*, 118-32. It is interesting to note that the Byzantine emperors divided their war booty in the same proportions.

found in the *Destan* a rather ostentatious description of the spoils and of their distribution.¹¹⁸ Slaves, the young and handsome being of the most value, and bringing the most profit, get special mention,^{119a} along with gold, silver and cloths. Umur sometimes gave his legal share of the booty to the poor and to his soldiers, and always gave generous gifts to his relatives and followers, thus living up to the image of the ideal *ghazi* leader as described in the *Kutadgu Bigig*, an eleventh century Turkish *Fürstenspiegel*,^{119b} as one who led his people on successful raids and generously gave away whatever were his own proceeds. His expedition to Kilia at the mouth of the Danube in 1341, a typical booty-seeking enterprise, yielded “countless slaves, girls and boys, as well as material goods, so that the whole of the Aydın-ili, was filled with wealth.”¹²⁰ Reference is made in the *Destan* to three cases of piracy on the open sea, evidently the most spectacular ones where Umur captured merchant ships. The first incident occurred in 1329 when he attacked a convoy of five coques off the island of Tenedos. In 1332 or 1333, on his way back from Monemvasia, he overpowered a coque “laden with pearls, rubies, gold and silver, as well as cloths.” He captured the abandoned ship, and after pillaging, burned it.¹²¹ Six or seven years later he captured near Euboea “a big coque laden with about one hundred boxes of rubies”. But the main sources for booty remained the incursions to the Aegean islands and the coastal areas in Greece, Macedonia and Thrace.

¹¹⁸ This is an element common to all of the historical literature written under the Ottomans, in the popular *ghaza* books, the *gesta et vita* literature, as well as the court historiography.

^{119a} For the importance of slaves in Islamic society see my “Servile Labor in the Ottoman Empire”, *The Mutual Effects of the Islamic and Judeo-Christian Worlds*, eds. A. Ascher, T. Halasi-Kun and B. Király, New York 1978, 25-52.

^{119b} See H. Inalcik, “Kutadgu Bilig’de Türk ve İran Siyaset Nazariye ve Gelenekleri”, *Reşid Rahmeti Arat İçin*, Ankara 1966, 269-71.

¹²⁰ The *Destan*, Mélikoff, verses: 1300-1306.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, verses: 695-710.

On various occasions Umur agreed to abstain from pillaging a land in return for a yearly tribute, a practice in perfect conformity with Islamic law. While the tribute paying country regarded it simply as a form of ransom, for the Muslims it meant much more, bringing that country under Islamic sway and placing it in the *dar al-Islam*, Abode of Islam.¹²² It was a tremendous feat for Umur to submit a Christian prince to tribute (*kharadj*), and the *Destan* recorded it as such.¹²³ Furthermore, such agreements were useful in neutralizing that prince and, in securing a base for operations in remote overseas lands: thus, they became an important instrument in Umur's attempt at establishing his supremacy in the Aegean. He exploited the new situation for further expansion of his power by finding constant employment for an increasing number of *ghazi* *azefs* joining him, and extending his field of action and influence. On the other hand, several local Christian governments found such agreements expedient for their part, not only in neutralizing Umur and saving their possessions from the raids of the *ghazis*, but also because it gave them the opportunity to use his force against their rivals: as for example, the Genoese and Catalans of Athens against the Venetians, Byzantium against its Balkan invaders, and later, Cantacuzenus against his rivals in Constantinople.

¹²² See "Dār al-'ahd", (Inalcik), *El*², II, 116.

¹²³ See especially the case with the Byzantine emperor: the *Destan*, Mélikoff, verses: 1050-1080.

It has been observed that, once the head of the emirate of Aydın-ili in 1334, Umur appears to have felt himself more responsible for the general interests of his state, and therefore he changed his policy towards Byzantium. Indeed, profiting from the rivalries between Christian governments and passing himself off as an indispensable ally for all parties, Umur actually appears to have pursued a well planned policy aimed at achieving supremacy in the Aegean world. But even in the period before 1334 when he was only Beg of the Smyrna frontier area his conduct was not solely determined by the quest for booty, but also by a concern for the security of his territory and the maintenance of a free passage to the sea and thence to Greece, so vitally important for his *ghazis*. To counterbalance Venetian naval supremacy and to discourage a crusade he must have seen the need for a policy of cooperation, or at least neutrality, with the Genoese and Byzantium.

DAS "ZWEIKAISERPROBLEM" UND SEIN EINFLUSS AUF DIE AUSSENPOLITIK DER KOMNENEN

RALPH-JOHANNES LILIE / BERLIN

Es ist eine weitverbreitete und, soweit ich sehe, allgemein anerkannte Meinung, daß das sog. Zweikaiserproblem, d.h. der Streit zwischen Byzanz und Deutschland um den Vorrang, oder besser: die Inanspruchnahme des Titels "imperator Romanorum" bzw. "αὐτοκράτωρ Ῥωμαίων" ausschließlich für sich selbst, die Außenpolitik der byzantinischen Kaiser überhaupt und die der Komnenenkaiser besonders immer wieder stark beeinflußt hat¹. Diese Annahme stützt sich im wesentlich auf drei Punkte:

¹ Allgemein cf. W. Ohnsorge, Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter. Die Bedeutung des byzantinischen Reiches für die Entwicklung der Staatsidee in Europa, Hildesheim 1947; zu dem 12. Jahrhundert insbesondere H.-D. Kahl, Römische Krönungspläne im Komnenenhaus? Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des Zweikaiserproblems im 12. Jahrhundert, in: Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 59 (1977, ersch. 1979) S. 259-320; P. Classen, Die Komnenen und die Kaiserkrone des Westens, in: Journal of Medieval History 3 (1977) S. 207-224; dort auch die Quellen und die gesamte frühere Literatur, der allenfalls noch J.G. Rowe, The Papacy and the Greeks (1122-1153), in: Church History 28 (1959) (Sonderabdruck 36 S.), hinzuzufügen wäre.

1. Die Verhandlungen zwischen Alexios I. Komnenos und Papst Paschalis II. 1112-1114 um die Kirchenunion und eine Krönung des byzantinischen Kaisers in Rom.
2. Die beiden Briefe Johannes' II. Komnenos an den Papst von 1139 und 1141.
3. Die Versuche Manuels I. Komnenos 1166/1167, sich zum Kaiser auch des Westens erheben zu lassen und dem deutschen Kaiser die Kaiserwürde abzuerkennen.

Man hat versucht, in diesen drei Ereignissen eine durchgehende Linie zu sehen, die darauf abzielte, die byzantinischen Kaiser unter Ausschaltung ihrer deutschen Rivalen zu den alleinigen Kaisern des Ostens wie des Westens zu machen². Es soll daher in diesem Aufsatz untersucht werden, ob und inwieweit diese Annahme zutrifft oder ob es nicht auch noch andere Erklärungsmöglichkeiten gibt.

Im Februar des Jahres 1111 war Papst Paschalis II. in Rom von dem deutschen König gefangenengenommen worden. Zwar kam er bald wieder frei und im April desselben Jahres auch zur Einigung mit Heinrich V., den er zwei Tage später sogar zum Kaiser krönte, doch erregte allein die Tatsache der Gefangennahme des Papstes ungeheures Aufsehen und führte zu kirchlichen Reaktionen gegen den deutschen Herrscher. Hier ist besonders das Wirken des Kardinallegaten Kuno von Praeneste zu beachten, der auf die Nachricht der päpstlichen Gefangenschaft hin den deutschen König von Jerusalem aus mit dem Bannfluch belegte und, als er auf der Rückreise Konstantinopel besuchte, auch die byzantinische Kirche dazu brachte, den Bannfluch gegen Heinrich V. zu schleudern³.

² cf. Kahl, Krönungspläne S. 261; da Kahl sozusagen die Quintessenz der bisherigen Forschung in diesem Bereich darstellt, werden wir uns an dieser Stelle hauptsächlich mit seinen Thesen befassen, aus denen sich ohne Schwierigkeiten auch die Meinungen seiner Vorgänger ersehen lassen.

³ cf. ausführlich R. Hiestand, Legat, Kaiser und Basileus. Bischof Kuno von Praeneste und die Krise des Papsttums von 1111/1112, in: *Aus Reichsgeschichte und Nordischer Geschichte*, Festschrift für K. Jordan, Stuttgart 1972, S. 141-150, passim.

Wohl im Spätsommer 1111⁴ sandte der byzantinische Kaiser einen Brief an die Römer, in dem er die Gefangennahme des Papstes durch den deutschen König tadelt, die Römer für ihren Widerstand lobt und ankündigt, wenn die Römer es wollten entweder selbst nach Rom zu kommen oder aber seinen Sohn Johannes zu schicken, um "gemäß der Sitte der alten Kaiser" vom Papst die Krone Roms zu erhalten: also zum "imperator Romanorum" gekrönt zu werden⁵. Die weiteren Ereignisse im einzelnen sind hier

4. Allgemein wird der Brief auf Anfang 1112 datiert (cf. F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565 - 1453*, Teil II.: *Regesten von 1025 - 1204*, München 1925, Nr. 1261), wohl gestützt auf Petrus Diaconus, der die Gesandtschaft unter diesem Jahr erwähnt. Andererseits läßt die Tatsache, daß der Brief an die Römer, nicht aber an den Papst gerichtet war, darauf schließen, daß man den Papst noch als handlungsunfähig, also gefangen, ansah (so auch Kahl, *Krönungspläne* S. 265). Da es aber kaum wahrscheinlich ist, daß Alexios noch Anfang 1112 nicht von der Freilassung des Papstes, die ja auch schon im Frühjahr 1111 erfolgt war, gewußt haben soll, dürfte ein früheres Datum für die Abfassung des Briefes wahrscheinlich sein. Petrus Diaconus berichtet den Vorgang zwar unter 1112, aber dies mag dadurch zu erklären sein, daß der Brief wegen des Winters unter Umständen erst im Frühjahr 1112 in Rom eingetroffen ist. F. Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis I^{er} Comnène* (1081 - 1118), Paris 1900, S. 260, läßt den Brief an die Römer und einen ähnlichen an den neuen Abt von Monte Cassino von derselben Gesandtschaft überbracht werden, was dann tatsächlich für 1112 spräche. Doch ist eine solche Annahme nicht zwingend, zumal wir für den Brief an die Römer nur die Mitteilung des Petrus Diaconus haben, von der wohl mit einiger Sicherheit feststeht, daß sie zumindest teilweise unzutreffend ist. Denkbar wäre demnach eine Gesandtschaft an die Römer, sobald Alexios durch Kuno von Praeneste von der Gefangennahme des Papstes erfahren hatte, und wenig später eine weitere mit reichen Geschenken an den neuen Abt von Monte Cassino. Es mußte für den Kaiser von Wichtigkeit sein, diesen neuen Mann und seine Einstellung gegenüber Byzanz, Rom, Unteritalien und dem Papsttum kennenzulernen und ihn, wenn notwendig und möglich, auf die eigene Seite zu ziehen.

5. Leonis Marsiani et Petri diaconi *Chronica monasterii Casinensis*, in *MGH SS* 77, S. 551-844 (Teil des *Petrus Diaconus: continuatio libri III. auctore Petro diacono*, S. 727-844), S. 785: "... sese, vel Iohannes filius eius, secundum morem antiquorum fidelium videlicet imperatorum a summo pontifice Romae coronam accipere".

uninteressant. Die Verhandlungen, die vor allem die Kirchenunion betrafen, zogen sich hin und wurden 1114 schließlich abgebrochen, ohne daß wir aus den Quellen einen direkten Grund erfahren. Sie scheinen einfach nicht fortgeführt worden zu sein.

Während Hiestand und Kahl, früheren Vorbildern folgend, diesen Brief und die folgenden mit dem Zweikaiserproblem motivieren, stellt Classen einen Zusammenhang mit dem ebenfalls 1111 stattgefundenen Tod Roger Borsas wie auch Bohemunds von Tarentt her: Alexios habe hier eine Gelegenheit zur Rückeroberung Italiens gesehen⁶.

Diese Annahme ist abzulehnen. Wie wir an anderer Stelle gezeigt haben, hat Alexios in den Jahren nach dem Vertrag von Devol 1108 eine Offensive gegen die Kreuzfahrerstaaten in Syrien und Palästina vorbereitet⁷. Gleichzeitig auch Italien anzugreifen, hätte die Kräfte des Reiches überstiegen, und die Quellen geben auch nicht den geringsten Hinweis auf solche Pläne des Kaisers⁸.

⁶ Classen, Kaiserkrone S. 208.

⁷ cf. R.-J. Lilie, Byzanz und die Kreuzfahrerstaaten. Studien zur Politik des byzantinischen Reiches gegenüber den Staaten der Kreuzfahrer in Syrien und Palästina bis zum Vierten Kreuzzug (1096 - 1204), München 1981 (ΠΟΙΚΙΛΑ ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΑ 1) S. 76ff.

⁸ Auch die Nachricht, daß einige unteritalische Normannenfürsten in die Verhandlungen miteinbezogen worden sind, kann Classen nicht für sich verbuchen. Wenn der Kaiser die Normannen Antiocheias angreifen wollte, so mußte ihm dringend daran gelegen sein, eine etwaige Hilfe durch die Normannen Unteritaliens und Siziliens für ihre antiochenischen Verwandten zu vereiteln, und was wäre dafür geeigneter gewesen, als einige normannische Barone auf die Seite der Griechen zu ziehen oder aber zumindest gegeneinander auszuspielen, so daß sie sich gegenseitig blockierten. Zu der byzantinischen Italienpolitik in diesen Jahren cf. ausführlich R.-J. Lilie, Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnene und der Angeloi (1081-1204), Amsterdam 1984, Kap. XIV. S. 358ff.

Ohnsorge, Kahl, Hiestand und andere vor ihnen sehen das Vorgehen des Alexios motiviert durch das Zweikaiserproblem⁹. Die Gefangennahme des Papstes durch den deutschen König habe in Alexios die Idee geweckt, das Zweikaiserproblem jetzt in byzantinischem Sinne zu lösen, da der deutsche Konkurrent ja im Bann und daher nicht "kaiserfähig" gewesen sei. Das "westliche" Kaisertum habe 1112 mithin als vakant angesehen werden können. Ob die angeblichen Krönungspläne des Alexios nun eine spätere redaktionelle Zutat der Chronik von Monte Monte Cassino gewesen sind, wie zuletzt Classen angenommen hat, oder ob in ihnen ein echter Kern verborgen ist, was Kahl unterstellt, kann hier nicht entschieden werden¹⁰. Bei einer Beurteilung aller Nachrichten und bei Berücksichtigung der bekannten byzantinischen Kaiserauffassung dürfte eine Krönung des Alexios selbst oder auch seines Sohnes und Mitkaisers Johannes in Rom unwahrscheinlich sein. Andererseits läßt sich nicht ausschließen, daß ein solches oder ähnliches Angebot aus taktischen Gründen gemacht worden ist, sei es nun ernstgemeint oder nicht. Auffällig ist allerdings, und auch

⁹ cf. Ohnsorge, Zweikaiserproblem S. 87f.; Kahl, Krönungspläne S. 264ff.; Hiestand, Kuno von Praeneste S. 150; andere, vorwiegend ältere Literatur: E. Norden, Das Papsttum und Byzanz. Die Trennung der beiden Mächte und das Problem ihrer Wiedervereinigung bis zum Untergang des byzantinischen Reiches (1453), Berlin 1903, S. 90; F. Dvornik, Byzanz und der römische Primat, Stuttgart 1966 (dt. Übers. der Ausg. Paris 1964: Byzance et la primauté Romaine), S. 182 (sehr kurz); S. Runciman, The Eastern Schism. A study of the papacy and the eastern churches during the XIth and XIIth centuries, Oxford 1955, S. 106ff.; zu der Rolle Monte Cassinos in den Beziehungen zwischen Byzanz und Rom cf. H. Bloch, Monte Cassino, Byzantium and the West in the Earlier Middle Ages, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 3 (1946) S. 163-224, bes. S. 222ff.; zu der theologischen Auseinandersetzung über den Primat im 12-Jahrhundert cf. zuletzt ausführlich J. Spiteris, *La Critica Bizantina del Primato Romano nel secolo XII*, Roma 1979 (*Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 208), passim (zu 1112 bes. S. 58ff.)

¹⁰ Classen, Kaiserkrone S. 210; Kahl, Krönungspläne S. 268ff.

Hiestand hat darauf hingewiesen, daß das Verhalten des Kaisers und der byzantinischen Kirche ohne Parallele in früherer Zeit ist¹¹. Tatsächlich haben weder der Kaiser noch die griechische Kirche in früheren Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Papst und Deutschen je in so eindeutiger Weise Stellung genommen. Besonders die förmliche Verurteilung und Bannung Heinrichs V. auf einer Synode in Konstantinopel ist ohne Beispiel, zumal sie an und für sich die Befugnisse des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel überstieg, da es sich hier um innere Angelegenheiten des Patriarchats von Rom handelte¹². Wenn des Kaisers Vorgehen durch das Zweikaiserproblem bestimmt ist - und auch die Verurteilung des deutschen Königs durch die Konstantinopolitaner Synode ist sicher nicht ohne Billigung des Kaisers erfolgt -, so ist unter Alexios eine ganz erhebliche Verschärfung der byzantinischen Haltung festzustellen, für die sachlich kein Grund vorliegt. Auch eine Begründung für den Abbruch bzw. das Auslaufen der Verhandlungen ist in den Quellen nicht zu finden. Kahl nimmt an, daß beide Seiten sich allmählich

¹¹ Hiestand, Kuno von Praeneste S. 150

¹² Hiestand, Kuno von Praeneste S. 150 sieht in der Verurteilung des deutschen Königs durch die Konstantinopolitaner Synode einen Vorgang, der "einer impliziten Anerkennung des römischen Primats sehr nahe kam". Doch ist dies zu weit gegriffen und berücksichtigt nicht die aktuelle Situation. Unter der Voraussetzung, daß der Papst gefangen, also handlungsunfähig und der römische Stuhl damit sozusagen zeitweilig vakant war, konnte der Patriarch des "Neuen Roms" quasi stellvertretend die Belange des Papstes wahrnehmen, ebenso wie der Kardinallegat Kuno von Praeneste dies getan hatte (Hiestand, *ibidem* S. 147). Darin lag keine Anerkennung des römischen Primats, sondern — theoretisch gesehen — allenfalls die Überzeugung der grundsätzlichen Einheit der Kirche, ungeachtet der Differenzen zwischen Rom und Konstantinopel. Wenn der Patriarch die Auffassung von der Gleichwertigkeit der fünf Patriarchate (eingeschlossen des römischen) vertrat, so war es nur logisch, daß er sich auch für die Belange des Papsttums einsetzte, sofern dieses es nicht selbst tun konnte. Mit einer so gearteten Argumentation dürfte man auch den Bannspruch der Synode begründet haben, immer vorausgesetzt, daß man eine Begründung überhaupt für notwendig hielt.

der Schwierigkeiten bewußt wurden, die einer persönlichen Begegnung zwischen Papst und Basileus entgegenstanden¹³. Doch ist dies seine Interpretation, die Quellen sagen nichts aus, und man muß sich fragen, ob Etiketteprobleme wirklich erst nach einigen Jahren Verhandlungen relevant werden konnten, während man sie vorher vernachlässigte.

Wenn aber das Vorgehen des byzantinischen Kaisers nicht befriedigend aus dem Zweikaiserproblem motiviert werden kann, so ist eine andere Erklärung notwendig. Man hat bisher die Politik des byzantinischen Kaisers gegenüber den Mächten des Westens immer nur einseitig in Zusammenhang mit den italienischen Interessen des Reiches bzw. mit dem Zweikaiserproblem gesehen. Es ist aber zu fragen, ob diese Sicht, so natürlich sie vom Standpunkt einer europazentrierten Geschichtsschreibung aus auch sein mag, für einen Staat gelten kann, der sein Zentrum am Bosphoros, der Grenzscheide zwischen Europa und Asien, gehabt hat. Ist hier nicht eher zu erwarten, daß die Westpolitik, wie auch die nach Osten gerichteten Anstrengungen, nur Teile einer politischen Grundkonzeption gewesen sind, die eben nicht nur allein für sich gesehen werden dürfen, sondern im Zusammenhang mit der gesamten Politik eines solchen Reiches? Wir haben gezeigt, daß Byzanz in den Jahren zwischen 1109 und 1112 eine Offensive gegen die Kreuzfahrerstaaten in Syrien und Palästina vorbereitete¹⁴, und wir wissen auch, daß die Kreuzfahrerstaaten aufgrund ihrer Entstehung wie auch aufgrund der Tatsache, daß sie die heiligen Stätten der Christenheit schützten, die besondere Gunst gerade des Papsttums genossen. Wer diese Staaten angriff, machte sich auch den Papst zum Feind,

¹³ Kahl, Krönungspläne S. 273ff.

¹⁴ Lilie, Byzanz und die Kreuzfahrerstaaten S. 76ff.; ders., Handel und Politik Kap. XIV. S. 356ff.

und das wußte man auch in Byzanz. Der "Kreuzzug" Bohemunds, der gerade erst glücklich abgewehrt worden war, hatte es deutlich gezeigt. Unter diesen Umständen muß es auf Alexios geradezu wie ein Geschenk des Himmels gewirkt haben, als der Kardinallegat Kuno von Praeneste in Konstantinopel erschien, die Byzantiner von der Gefangennahme des Papstes durch den deutschen König unterrichtete und sie, wie man annehmen darf, um ihre Hilfe ersuchte. Alexios stimmte sofort zu, auch die griechische Kirche schleuderte den Bann gegen Heinrich V., und der Kaiser schickte entsprechende Botschaften nach Italien. Dies war die Möglichkeit, den Papst von der Gutwilligkeit der Byzantiner zu überzeugen. Daß der deutsche König hierdurch praktisch in eine Gegnerschaft zu dem Reich der Griechen getrieben wurde, hatte wenig zu besagen: Deutschland stellte zu dieser Zeit keine Gefahr für Byzanz dar. In den Kreuzfahrerstaaten besaß es keinen Einfluß, und die spätere Entwicklung in Unteritalien war 1111/12 noch nicht abzusehen. Ein altes Sprichwort sagt: "Der Feind meines Feindes ist mein Freund", und in diesem Sinn handelte der Kaiser. Er konnte hoffen, den Papst so weit zu gewinnen, daß dieser sich nicht aktiv gegen ein Einschreiten der Byzantiner in Syrien wenden würde. Aus demselben Motiv heraus sind die Unionsverhandlungen der folgenden Jahre zu sehen. Solange der Papst auf eine Wiedervereinigung der Kirchen hoffen konnte, würde er möglicherweise das byzantinische Vorgehen in Syrien tolerieren. Nachdem aber die Pläne eines Angriffs auf die Kreuzfahrerstaaten sich zerschlagen hatten, bestand auch keine Notwendigkeit einer Einigung mit Rom mehr. Man brach die Verhandlungen zwar nicht ab, was unnütze Verärgerung in Rom hätte hervorrufen können, aber man ließ sie allmählich auslaufen. Der antideutsche Inhalt der Gesandtschaften von 1111/12 ist somit nicht als eine Folge des Zweikaiserproblems anzusehen, sondern Deutschland war hier nicht mehr als ein Mittel, durch das man den Papst als potentiellen Gegner des byzantinischen Reiches bei einem Angriff auf Syrien und Palästina auszuschalten hoffte.

Die zweite Episode, die man allgemein für die Bedeutung des Zweikaiserproblems heranzieht, sind die beiden Briefe des Kaisers Johannes II. Komnenos von 1139 und 1141 an den Papst¹⁵. Da der

¹⁵ Dölger, Regesten Nr. 1302 (Juni 1124) und 1303 (April 1126); die Forschung hat

Text der beiden Briefe für die Interpretation eine besondere Rolle spielt, sei vor Eintritt in die Diskussion kurz der Inhalt angeführt¹⁶: Der Brief von 1139 gibt sich als Antwortbrief auf eine päpstliche Botschaft und lobt ausdrücklich den Wunsch des Papstes nach einer Vereinigung der Kirchen, die auch, wie in verschiedenen Wendungen wiederholt wird, der Wunsch des Kaisers sei. Als Grund für die Verzögerung der kaiserlichen Antwort wird der byzantinische Feldzug gegen die Ungläubigen im Osten angeführt, über den selbst kaum Worte nötig seien, da dies alles den "allerchristlichen Lateinern" des Ostens bekannt sei. Die päpstlichen Gesandten seien vom Kaiser über seine Absichten aufgeklärt worden. Der byzantinische Gegengesandte werde die weiteren Verhandlungen führen.

unterdessen einhellig die beiden Briefe auf 1139 und 1141 datiert, cf. die Zusammenstellung bei Kahl, Krönungspläne S. 278 Anm. 55. Tatsächlich dürfte die Datierung auf 1139/41 nicht mehr zu bezweifeln sein.

¹⁶ Hier zitiert nach der Edition von Sp. P. Lampros, *Αὐτοκρατόρων τοῦ Βυζαντίου χρυσόβουλλα καὶ χρυσᾶ γράμματα, ἀναφερόμενα εἰς τὴν ἑνωσιν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*, in: *Neos Hellenomnemon* 11 (1914) S. 93-128 u. 241-254; Nr. 1. S. 106-108 (griech. Text) und Nr. 2 S. 108f. (lat. Text) sowie für den Brief von 1141 Nr. 3. S. 109-111 (griech. Text) und Nr. 4. S. 111f. (lat. Text).

Auf welchen Papstbrief das kaiserliche Schreiben die Antwort sein soll, ist nicht klar. Da die Verzögerung der Antwort mit einem Feldzug im Osten begründet wurde, der nach Lage der Dinge nur das Unternehmen gegen Antiocheia gewesen sein kann, dürfte der Papstbrief wohl vor dem Herbst 1137 geschrieben worden sein. Dagegen spricht auch nicht die Erwähnung päpstlicher Gesandter, da das Schreiben des Johannes offen läßt, wann der Kaiser mit den Gesandten gesprochen hatte¹⁷. In jedem Fall nimmt Johannes hier Verhandlungen, die vor seinem Syrienzug begonnen worden waren, wieder auf und betont sehr stark das beiderseitige Interesse an der Kirchenunion.

Demgegenüber sind die Akzente bei dem Brief vom April 1141 leicht verschoben. Zwar betont der Kaiser auch hier nachdrücklich sein Interesse an der Kirchenunion, aber er legt, im Gegensatz zu dem vorherigen Schreiben, das Gewicht auch auf die Rolle des Kaisertums, das wie die geistige Macht (“ἡ πνευματική ἐξουσία”= “spiritualis potestas” in der lateinischen Fassung) von Gott eingesetzt worden sei und daher beanspruchen könne, was ihm zustehe: “...καὶ ὁ τῶν ὅλων δεσπότης ἀποδοθῆναι τὰ Καίσαρος ἐπέτρεψε Καίσαρι”. Beide Mächte, spirituelle wie weltliche (“ἡ πνευματική ἐξουσία - ἡ κοσμική καὶ σωματική ἐξουσία”) mußten in Übereinstimmung handeln. In der Schrift werde gesagt, daß es zwei Schwerter gebe, die hinreichend seien etc. Der Kaiser führt diese Gedanken noch weiter aus und verweist im übrigen auf seine Ausführungen gegenüber den päpstlichen Gesandten und auf die dem byzantinischen Gegengesandten beigegebenen Instruktionen.

Wenn wir beide Briefe ohne Rücksicht auf die politische Situation interpretieren, so ergibt sich ein eindeutiges Interesse des Kaisers für die Kirchenunion, wobei im zweiten Brief die Eigenständigkeit und die Gleichberechtigung des Kaisertums, der welt-

¹⁷ Rowe, *Papacy and the Greeks* S. 9 nimmt eine Wiederaufnahme der Verhandlungen von 1139 durch den Papst an, doch bezieht der Brief des Kaisers sich ausdrücklich auf eine päpstliche Botschaft vor dem Syrienfeldzug von 1137/38.

lichen Macht, gegenüber der spirituellen Macht, hier dem Papsttum, noch gesondert herausgehoben wird. Von einer Bezugnahme auf das Zweikaiserproblem, wie es allgemein angenommen wird, kann ich nichts entdecken, sieht man einmal von den "zwei Schwertern" ab, die hinreichend seien. Ob man diese Phrase aber als Angriff auf den Kaiseranspruch der Deutschen werten kann, ist zu bezweifeln. So völlig eindeutig ist sie eigentlich nicht, wenn auch als Bild durchaus gelungen¹⁸. Daß sie in ihrer Ausschließlichkeit auf nur zwei Gewalten, von denen eine hier das Papsttum, die andere das byzantinische Kaisertum ist, dem deutschen König den "römischen" Kaisertitel bestreitet, ist zuzugeben. Aber das ist ohnehin die grundsätzliche Position der byzantinischen Kaiser gewesen, die Johannes auch gegenüber Deutschland selbst vertreten hat, sogar dann, wenn die Beziehungen zwischen beiden Staaten ansonsten gut gewesen sind, wie es 1141/42 durchaus der Fall gewesen ist¹⁹. Aber diese grundsätzliche Auffassung schloß weder ein Zusammengehen mit den Deutschen aus, noch war sie bestimmend für die byzantinische Außenpolitik.

Kahl sieht, früheren Forschern folgend, den Anstoß für die angebliche ideologische Offensive des Johannes in dem Umstand, daß der deutsche König Konrad III. noch nicht Kaiser geworden war (und es auch niemals werden sollte)²⁰. Das westliche Kaisertum sei damit sozusagen vakant gewesen, und dies habe in Johannes die Hoffnung geweckt, das ganze Problem in byzantinischem Sinne entscheiden zu können.

¹⁸ Kahl, Krönungspläne S. 279.

¹⁹ cf. den Brief des Johannes an Konrad III., in dem dieser als "rex" bezeichnet wird. Man sollte, gerade im Mittelalter, solche "Sticheleien" nicht unterschätzen. ihnen aber auch nicht zu viel Bedeutung beimessen.

²⁰ cf. vor allem W. Ohnsorge, "Kaiser" Konrad III. Zur Geschichte des staufischen Staatsgedankens, in: W. Ohnsorge, *Abendland und Byzanz*, Sammelband Darmstadt 1963, S. 364-386 (zuerst in: *MiÖG* 46 (1932) S. 343-360), S. 375ff.); Kahl, *Krönungspläne* S. 278.

Diese Auffassung übersieht zweierlei: Einmal sind die deutschen Könige des Mittelalters so gut wie niemals sofort römische Kaiser geworden. Bisweilen lagen Jahre zwischen der Erhebung zum deutschen König und der Erlangung des Kaisertitels. Insofern konnte auch Konrad III. 1141 noch durchaus auf den Kaisertitel hoffen. Wichtiger aber ist der Umstand, daß Johannes 1141 mit Konrad III. in ernsthaften Verhandlungen um eine eheliche Verbindung beider Herrscherhäuser stand, die 1142 auch von Erfolg gekrönt waren. Kahl bestreitet die Ernsthaftigkeit dieser Verhandlungen. Gerade in Krisenzeiten hätte es immer wieder solche ergebnislosen Kontakte gegeben. Und auch die von Konrad und Johannes projektierte Heirat zwischen Manuel Komnenos und Bertha von Sulzbach sei erst 1146 unter völlig veränderten Bedingungen zustande gekommen²¹. Diese Beobachtung ist zwar richtig, vernachlässigt aber total den Umstand, daß die Verhandlungen zwischen Johannes und Konrad bereits im Sommer 1142 erfolgreich abgeschlossen waren. Zu diesem Zeitpunkt befand Bertha von Sulzbach sich bereits in Konstantinopel, und es ist so gut wie unmöglich, daß sie ohne Absicherung in die byzantinische Hauptstadt gekommen ist. Die Verhandlungen müssen demnach bereits im Sommer 1142 erfolgreich beendet worden sein. Die Verzögerung um vier Jahre, bis die Hochzeit tatsächlich gefeiert wurde, hat ihre Ursache nicht in Dissenzen zwischen Deutschen und Griechen, sondern in dem Umstand, daß Manuel plötzlich wider Erwarten Kaiser geworden war, womit sich die Geschäftsgrundlage verändert hatte und neu verhandelt werden mußte²².

²¹ Kahl, Krönungspläne S. 279, 281.

²² cf. hierzu ausführlich Lilie, Handel und Politik, Kap. XV. und XVI. S. 386ff., 398ff.

Wenn aber die Eheverhandlungen zwischen Byzanz und Deutschland ernsthaft gewesen sind — und hieran besteht kein Zweifel —, dann ist ein gleichzeitiger Versuch des byzantinischen Kaisers, dem deutschen Rivalen die (westliche) Kaiserkrone streitig zu machen, äußerst unwahrscheinlich, denn das hätte dieses Heiratsprojekt mit Sicherheit zusammenbrechen lassen. Gerade Konrad III., der ja noch kein Kaiser war, reagierte in solchen Fragen äußerst sensibel, wie Ohnsorge gezeigt hat²³, und er hätte die Verhandlungen, die zudem ja von Byzanz ausgegangen waren, wenn wir Otto von Freising glauben können, kaum weitergeführt, wenn er erfahren hätte, daß Johannes versuchte, ihm den Kaisertitel, den er in den Verhandlungen mit Byzanz trotz fehlender Krönung führte, streitig zu machen. Die Tatsache, daß Byzanz das "römische" Kaisertum für sich in Anspruch nahm, konnte Konrad unberücksichtigt lassen, die Deutschen verhielten sich umgekehrt genauso. Etwas völlig anderes aber wäre es gewesen, wenn der "Imperator Constantinopolitanus" (nach deutscher Auffassung) versucht hätte, durch den Papst die Krönung oder zumindest Anerkennung als "Imperator Romanorum" zu erlangen. Es erscheint daher (auch methodisch) als bedenklich, die Heiratsverhandlungen zwischen Byzanz und Deutschland in dieser Zeit in Frage zu stellen, obwohl sie erfolgreich gewesen sind, die angeblichen Kontakte zwischen Papsttum und Konstantinopel aber als völlig ernsthafte, gegen das deutsche Kaisertum gerichtete, Bemühungen des byzantinischen Kaisers zu interpretieren, obwohl sie völlig im Sande verlaufen sind. Daß der Papst seinerseits in die deutsch - byzantinischen Verhandlungen zumindest teil- und zeitweise eingeweiht war

²³ Ohnsorge, "Kaiser" Konrad III. passim.

und sie billigte, ist ein weiteres Indiz gegen eine Interpretation des Johannesbriefes in Zusammenhang mit dem Zweikaiserproblem²⁴.

Man wird beide Briefe des Kaisers im Gesamtzusammenhang der byzantinischen Politik sehen müssen, und von hier aus erfahren sie auch ihre Erklärung, die allerdings mit dem Zweikaiserproblem nichts zu tun hat.

Wie schon an anderer Stelle gezeigt worden ist, hatte Johannes II. Komnenos einen Zug gegen die Kreuzfahrerstaaten vorbereitet, zu diesem Zweck das Bündnis mit Pisa und vielleicht auch Venedig erneuert und war, um die Normannen Rogers II. zu neutralisieren, dem antinormannischen Bündnis zwischen Deutschland, Pisa, Venedig und dem Papsttum, das das Unternehmen allerdings nur mit Vorbehalten unterstützte²⁵, beigetreten²⁶. Eine gesonderte Fühlungnahme mit dem Papst hatte dagegen nicht stattgefunden, obwohl es Gelegenheiten gegeben hätte: 1137 war eine byzantinische Gesandtschaft an den deutschen Kaiser Lothar III. abgegangen, die ohne Schwierigkeiten auch den Papst hätte aufsuchen können. Stattdessen erging sich ein Mitglied der Gesandtschaft, ein "quidam philosophus", wie Petrus Diaconus sagt²⁷, in scharfen Attacken auf den Papst. Wir wissen nicht, ob er in kaiserlichem

²⁴ *Otonis episcopi Frisingensis et Rahewini Gesta Frederici seu rectius Cronica. Textum imperatori transmissum editionibus G. Waitz et B. Simson nusus e codice Parisiensi* ed. F.-J. Schmale, 2. korr. Aufl. Darmstadt 1975 (Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters. Freiherr vom Stein — Gedächtnisausgabe Bd. XVII.), I. 26, S. 174.

²⁵ Vor allem aufgrund der eigenen Ansprüche auf Unteritalien, cf. Rowe, *Papacy and the Greeks* passim.

²⁶ cf. Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzfahrerstaaten* S. 108.

²⁷ Petrus Diaconus S. 833.

Auftrag oder aus persönlichem Glaubenseifer gesprochen hat. Beides ist möglich. Dennoch dürfte es unwahrscheinlich sein, daß Johannes II. einen ausgesprochenen Lateiner- oder wenigstens Papsthasser ohne Hintersinn einer solchen Gesandtschaft beigegeben haben sollte. Der Papst verfolgte mit Unteritalien und Sizilien eigene Pläne, die den Absichten der Deutschen zum Teil zuwiderliefen. Es mag sein, daß der Angriff des Gesandten auf den Papst in diesem Fall mehr aus der Absicht heraus erfolgt ist, den deutschen Kaiser positiv zu beeindrucken, als den Papst zu demütigen, wenngleich letzteres natürlich nicht ausgeschlossen werden kann. In jedem Fall scheint aber festzustehen, daß Johannes II. Komnenos 1137 geglaubt hat, auf den Papst verzichten zu können, der sich ohnehin in sehr bedrängter Lage befand. Von ihm schien keine Gefahr für die byzantinischen Pläne in Nordsyrien und Palästina befürchtet werden zu müssen.

Diese Einschätzung war falsch. Der Papst reagierte auf den Vormarsch des Kaisers. Im Frühjahr 1138 verurteilte er das Vorgehen des Kaisers, den er als Häretiker brandmarkte, und bedrohte alle lateinischen Söldner im Heer mit dem Kirchenbann, wenn sie Byzanz weiter bei seinem Angriff auf Antiocheia unterstützten²⁸. Im Sommer desselben Jahres kehrte Johannes ohne den erstrebten Erfolg nach Konstantinopel zurück.

Der Brief des Kaisers vom Sommer des Jahres 1139 dürfte die Reaktion auf das Verhalten des Papstes gewesen sein, eine Reaktion, die um so geschickter war, als sie jede direkte Bezugnahme vermeidet. Johannes behandelt die Verurteilung seines Vormarsches praktisch als nicht geschehen und knüpft an frühere Verhandlungen vor seinem Aufbruch nach Syrien an. Dennoch zielt sein Brief sehr konsequent auf das päpstliche Edikt. Der

²⁸ Ph. Jaffé - S. Loewenfeld, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*, 2 Bde. Leipzig 1885/88² (Nachdruck Graz 1956), Nr. 7883 (28. März 1138); cf. zuletzt hierzu Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzfahrerstaaten* S. 122ff.

Kaiser betont seinen Willen zur Kirchenunion, er ist also kein Häretiker, ja seine ganze Expedition hatte sich überhaupt nicht gegen die Franken Syriens gerichtet, sondern, wie diese selbst wußten (und dem Papst berichten konnten) gegen die Feinde des Kreuzes, die er mit den Franken zusammen bekämpft hatte. Der Papst hatte somit keinen Grund, die Byzantiner zu verurteilen. Wir können annehmen, daß die mündlichen Aufträge, die den Gesandten mitgegeben worden waren, in die gleiche Richtung gingen. Der Brief des Kaisers ist mithin als Versuch anzusehen, den päpstlichen Unmut über den byzantinischen Angriff auf die Staaten der Kreuzfahrer in Syrien und Palästina zu besänftigen.

Innozenz II. scheint hierauf eingegangen zu sein, denn 1141 finden wir päpstliche Gesandte in Konstantinopel²⁹. Aber gleichzeitig stellte sich für Johannes 1141 die Frage einer neuen Offensive gegen Antiocheia. Wir haben gezeigt, daß eine der diplomatischen Absicherungen dieses geplanten Unternehmens das Heiratsprojekt zwischen Manuel Komnenos, der für eine Karriere in Syrien bestimmt war, und Bertha von Sulzbach gewesen ist.³⁰ Aber auch der Papst durfte nicht vernachlässigt werden, da man andernfalls wiederum dessen Einschreiten befürchten mußte, und hier liegt der Anlaß für den zweiten Kaiserbrief vom April 1141. Zunächst erkennt Johannes, erstaunlich direkt für einen byzantinischen Kaiser, den Primat des Papstes in geistlichen Dingen an. Aber er hebt auch die besondere Rolle des Kaisertums hervor, das ebenfalls von Christus eingesetzt worden sei und Anspruch auf das, was ihm gehöre, habe: Gebt dem Kaiser, was des Kaisers ist. Und Antiocheia war des Kaisers. Es folgen Bekundungen darüber, daß beide Mächte in Eintracht handeln müßten, und schließlich wieder der Wunsch nach der Union der Kirchen. Mit anderen Worten: Der Papst soll eine Unterwerfung der Kreuzfahrerstaaten, zumindest

29. cf. den Hinweis in dem zweiten Brief des Kaisers vom April 1141.

³⁰ cf. Lilie, *Handel und Politik* Kap. XV. S. 386ff.

Antiocheias, akzeptieren. Die gleichzeitige implizite Anerkennung des römischen Primats und der Wunsch nach der Kirchenunion sollen dem Papst zeigen, daß die Rechte Roms von einer solchen Unterwerfung nicht berührt werden. Mehr noch: Der byzantinische Unterhändler wird sicher nicht unterlassen haben darauf hinzuweisen, daß Byzanz die Kreuzfahrerstaaten ja gar nicht vereinnahmen wolle, sondern beabsichtige, sie als selbständige Herrschaft und sogar noch vergrößert bestehen zu lassen. Manuel sollte, wie Kinnamos berichtet, Herr über ein Fürstentum werden, das sich von Attaleia bis nach Antiocheia mit dem Hinterland Zypern erstrecken sollte³¹. Er war ein Byzantiner, gewiß. Aber er war mit einer Deutschen verlobt — zumindest liefen entsprechende Verhandlungen — und konnte daher auf die Unterstützung beider Reiche rechnen, während der Papst darauf vertrauen konnte, daß ein solcher Herrscher, der auch unter dem Einfluß des deutschen Reiches stehen würde, die Kreuzfahrerstaaten nicht nur nicht an Byzanz — das aber ja auch wieder rechtgläubig sein würde — ausliefern, sondern sie sogar zu größerer Blüte führen würde: Insgesamt gesehen ein verlockendes Angebot, das Innozenz II. akzeptiert zu haben scheint, denn wir wissen aus einem Brief Konrads an Johannes, daß der Papst in die Heiratsverhandlungen miteinbezogen worden war und sie gebilligt hatte³². Ich glaube nicht, daß diese Einwilligung sich ausschließlich auf den Kampf gegen Roger

³¹ Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum, ed. A. Meineke, Bonn 1836, S.19.

³² Otto von Freising, Gesta I. 26, S. 174.

II. bezogen hat: Soweit es Byzanz betrifft, war der "syrische" Aspekt dieser Heirat ohnehin der ausschlaggebende³³.

Damit aber fällt die wichtigste Quelle, die man bisher für byzantinische Krönungspläne zur Zeit des Johannes herangezogen hat, in sich zusammen. Ein Verteidiger der "Zweikaisertheorie" könnte jetzt allerdings Einspruch erheben und auf die Notiz einer, kürzlich von P. Schreiner publizierten, Kleinchronik verweisen, die etwa um 1300 entstanden ist, aber sicher auf älteren Quellen beruht³⁴. Laut dieser Notiz wollte Johannes II. seinen ältesten Sohn Alexios zum Kaiser in Rom und den zweitältesten Andronikos zum Kaiser in Jerusalem machen, während Isaak und Manuel in Konstantinopel herrschen sollten. Jedoch sind diese Angaben nicht vertrauenswürdig. Wir wissen, daß nicht Andronikos, sondern Manuel für eine Karriere in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten bestimmt gewesen ist. Noch unwahrscheinlicher ist die Mitteilung, daß Alexios in Rom als Kaiser regieren sollte. Einmal abgesehen davon, daß der Mitkaiser und präsuntive Nachfolger des Johannes sich kaum zugunsten seiner beiden jüngsten Brüder auf ein Abenteuer in Rom eingelassen und auf das sichere Konstantinopel verzichtet hätte, ist ein byzantinisches Kaisertum in Rom, selbst mit der Unterstützung des Pap-

³³ Inwieweit diese Unionsangebote des byzantinischen Kaisers ernst gemeint waren, sei dahingestellt. 1137 hatte Johannes II. in Kilikien griechische Bischöfe eingesetzt (cf. Lilie, Byzanz und die Kreuzfahrstaaten S. 123). Ob sein jetziges Nachgeben einen grundsätzlichen Sinneswandel bedeutete oder nur der Ziel hatte, sich bis zur einmal vollzogenen Eroberung der Kreuzfahrerstaaten vor unliebsamen Überraschungen zu schützen, läßt sich nicht mehr entscheiden.

³⁴ Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken, ed. P. Schreiner, 3 Bde. Wien 1975/77/79, (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Vindobonensis XII. 1-3), Bd. I. Nr. 6, S. 58: "τοῦτο δὲ εἶπε (erg. Ἰωάννης) διὰ τὸ βουλευσασθαι τὸν μὲν πρῶτον υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν κῆριν Ἀλέξιον, ποιῆσαι βασιλέα ἐν Ῥώμῃ, τὸν δὲ κῆριν Ἀνδρόνικον ἐν τοῖς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων τόποις καὶ τὸν κῆριν Ἰσαάκιον ἀλλαχοῦ· ὁχτός δὲ μετὰ τοῦ κυροῦ Μανουὴλ ὡς ἀτελοῦς ὄντος βασιλεύειν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει" (Kommentar S. Bd. II. S. 164f.).

stes, nicht vorstellbar. Weder die Deutschen noch die Normannen hätten es hingenommen und Byzanz war nicht einmal ansatzweise stark genug, gegen diese beiden Mächte eine Rückeroberung Italiens auch nur zu versuchen, ganz zu schweigen von einer gleichzeitigen Eroberung Syriens und Palästinas mit der Errichtung eines weiteren Kaisertums dortselbst. Die Nachrichten der Kurzchronik sind daher abzulehnen. Dennoch sollte man sie nicht gänzlich außerachtlassen, denn auch wenn das Zweikaiserproblem die Außenpolitik des Johannes wie des Alexios nicht beeinflußt hat, so heißt das doch nicht, daß es in Byzanz nicht als Problem empfunden worden ist. Die Byzantiner haben die Existenz eines westlichen Kaisertums sicherlich als Herausforderung empfunden³⁵, und es mag sein, daß in einer solchen Atmosphäre auch phantastische Pläne zur Wiedererrichtung des alten römischen Kaisertums etwa in Gestalt der Tetrarchie des Diokletian oder der Zweiteilung des Reiches unter den Nachfolgern Konstantins I. geschmiedet und auch geglaubt worden sind. Die Kleinchronik scheint solche Gedanken widerzuspiegeln. Aber so wild Gerüchte dieser und ähnlicher Art auch gewuchert haben mögen, festzuhalten bleibt, daß die Politik des Kaisers von ihnen nicht beeinflußt worden ist, sondern sich an den Realitäten orientierte. Und diese Realitäten hießen: Bündnis mit Deutschland und Absicherung byzantinischer Eroberungspläne in Syrien und Palästina durch Unionsangebote an den Papst. Für Phantasien einer Ausschaltung des westlichen Kaisertums zugunsten der Herrscher in Konstantinopel blieb da kein Raum.

Während solche Gedanken in der Politik der ersten beiden Kaiser des Komnenhauses also keine Rolle gespielt haben, sind sie für die Politik Manuels quellenmäßig nachweisbar. Das beginnt schon 1157, als eine byzantinische Gesandtschaft, die in Deutschland die Erhebung des Herzogs Friedrich, des Sohnes des verstorbenen Königs Konrad III., zum Ritter fordern sollte, dem deutschen Kai-

³⁵ cf. etwa die Ausführungen bei Kinnamos S. 218ff.

ser offenbar die geforderte Anerkennung verweigerte und erst durch Druck Barbarossas hierzu gezwungen werden konnte: "Placatus tamen multis eorum (d.h. der Gesandten) precibus et lacrimis imperator veniam super his donavit, accepta sponsione, quod deinceps spernentes ampullos, nonnisi eam quam deceret Romanum principem et Urbis ac orbis dominatorem, reverentiam suis salutationibus apportarent"³⁶. Dies könnte darauf hindeuten, und Ohnsorge hat es so aufgefaßt, daß Manuel dem deutschen Kaiser 1157 in schärferer Form als früher die geforderte Titulatur verweigert hat³⁷, doch ist fraglich, von wem die Brüskierung ausgegangen ist. Hierzu ist ein kurzer Blick auf die Situation des Jahres 1157 notwendig. Wir wissen, daß Manuel mindestens bis 1156 mit einem gemeinsamen deutsch — byzantinischen Feldzug gegen die Normannen Unteritaliens gerechnet hat. Erst die Absage des deutschen Kaisers 1156 ließ diese Träume zerrinnen³⁸. Manuel scheint sich mit dem Scheitern nicht abgefunden zu haben. Er schickte mehrfach Gesandte nach Deutschland. In diesem Sinn dürfte auch die Gesandtschaft von 1157 zu verstehen sein. Der von den Gesandten erbetene Ritterschlag Friedrichs ist hierbei sicherlich nur Vorwand gewesen. Nachdem der deutsche Kaiser 1156 ausdrücklich erklärt hatte, daß eine Anerkennung der byzantinischen Ansprüche auf Italien nicht in Frage komme, hat Manuel unter dem Vorwand des Ritterschlags für Friedrich — an und für sich überraschend, aber nicht unnatürlich, da die byzantinische Kaiserin Bertha—Eirene als Adoptivtochter Konrads und Schwägerin des toten Königs gleichzeitig auch Tante und Adoptivschwester des Sohnes Konrads war, was auch Rahewin hervorhebt

³⁶ Rahewin, *Gesta* III. 6, S. 404.

³⁷ Ohnsorge, *Zweikaiserproblem* S. 104.

³⁸ cf. hierzu ausführlich Lilie, *Handel und Politik* Kap. XVI. S. 429ff.

— 1157 offenbar noch einmal sondiert, wie ernst die Ablehnung Barbarossas zu verstehen war. Der deutsche Kaiser konnte die Gesandtschaft nicht einfach abweisen, zumal ihr eigentliches Anliegen nicht offiziell vorgebracht wurde. Aber er scheint versucht zu haben, durch die demonstrativ harte Behandlung der Gesandten von vornherein zu verstehen zu geben, daß er an einer Verständigung mit Byzanz nicht interessiert war, wenn Manuel nicht auf Italien verzichtete. Als Weg hierfür bot sich ein Hervorheben der unterschiedlichen Auffassung des Titels "Imperator Romanorum" an. Es ist unwahrscheinlich, daß die Gesandten den Kaiser anders titulierte haben als andere griechische Gesandtschaften vor ihnen. 1157 war Manuel noch an einem Zusammengehen mit Friedrich interessiert, und es wäre äußerst unklug gewesen, den Deutschen durch eine Etikettefrage zu provozieren.

Byzantinische Gesandte sind sowohl vor 1157 als auch danach mit dem deutschen Kaiser zusammengetroffen, ohne daß wir von Auseinandersetzungen über die Titelfrage etwas wissen. Es scheint daher glaubhaft, daß Friedrich I. 1157 hier bewußt einen härteren Kurs eingeschlagen hat, nicht so sehr wegen des Titelstreites selbst, als vielmehr um Byzanz durch das Hervorheben dieses Punktes seine Ablehnung einer Verbindung mit den Griechen zu zeigen³⁹. Auch hier ist das "Zweikaiserproblem" also nur ein Kampfmittel, das eingesetzt wird, wenn die politische Situation es sinnvoll erscheinen läßt.

1157 ist Barbarossa der "aggressivere" Teil gewesen. In den sechziger Jahren des 12. Jahrhunderts aber ist nun eindeutig belegbar, daß Manuel versucht hat, dem Deutschen die Kaiserwürde aberkennen zu lassen, womit er automatisch der alleinige und einzige rechtmäßige Imperator Romanorum geworden wäre. Nach

³⁹ So ähnlich, wenn auch mit einer anderen Beurteilung der politischen Lage, Kahl, Krönungspläne S. 284, der die Verschärfung der Kaiserfrage 1157 ebenfalls von Barbarossa ausgehen läßt.

byzantinischer Auffassung war er es ohnehin, aber er strebte nach einer Anerkennung dieses Faktums auch bei den Lateinern. Es scheint allerdings, daß diese Pläne ursprünglich nicht von Byzanz, sondern von den italienischen Gegnern des deutschen Kaisers ausgegangen sind und daß die Griechen sie nur aufgegriffen haben. Da dieses Problem erst vor kurzem eine ausführliche Behandlung erfahren hat, die durchaus überzeugend ist, sei an dieser Stelle auf eine nochmalige Erörterung der einzelnen Vorgänge und Aktionen verzichtet⁴⁰. Es ergibt sich aber zweifelsfrei folgendes: Die Aktualisierung des Zweikaiserproblems in den sechziger Jahren des 12. Jahrhunderts korrespondiert eindeutig mit dem Kampf um Italien, wobei Byzanz die deutschfeindlichen Kräfte unterstützt hat. Stellt man dazu in Rechnung, daß die Anstöße zur Translation des Kaisertitels von Deutschland auf Byzanz — als solche wurde es in Italien aufgefaßt — von den Italienern ausgegangen sind, so wird ziemlich klar, daß es hier nicht um die endgültige Klärung eines alten Problems zwischen Deutschland und Byzanz gegangen ist (das den Italienern völlig gleichgültig gewesen sein dürfte), sondern daß das "Zweikaiserproblem" als ideologische Waffe gegen den deutschen Kaiser eingesetzt worden ist⁴¹. Der Kampf um Italien wurde nicht nur mit politischen, militärischen und finanziellen Waffen ausgetragen, sondern — wie nicht anders zu erwarten — auch auf der ideologischen Ebene. Damit aber, und das ist in unserem Zusammenhange entscheidend, kann auch diese Episode nicht als Beweis für eine Einwirkung des Zweikaiserproblems auf die Politik des byzantinischen Reiches im 12. Jahrhundert genommen werden. Es ist kennzeichnend, daß das "Zweikaiserproblem" in der Politik beider Reiche bis 1157 keine Rolle gespielt hat (im 12. Jahrhundert), und daß es von Byzanz nach 1170, als Manuel wieder mit Deutschland zusammenzugehen beschloß, nicht mehr ins Spiel geb-

⁴⁰ cf. Kahl, Krönungspläne S. 282-320; Classen, Kaiserkrone S. 212-220 (dort auch die ältere Literatur und die maßgeblichen Quellen).

⁴¹ So auch Ohnsorge, "Kaiser" Konrad III. S. 384f. Anm. 59, der diese Haltung später allerdings wieder zugunsten der These eines endgültigen Austrags des Streits um die Zweikaiserfrage aufgegeben hat (Ohnsorge, Zweikaiserproblem S. 104ff.).

racht worden ist⁴². Um Mißverständnissen vorzubeugen: Ich bestreite nicht, daß man sich auf beiden Seiten, der deutschen wie der byzantinischen, des Problems, das aus dem beiderseitigen und einander ausschließenden Anspruch auf den Rang eines Imperator Romanorum erwuchs, bewußt gewesen ist. Hierfür gibt es genügend und überzeugende Beweise, auch und gerade im 12. Jahrhundert. Ebenso wenig ist zu bestreiten, daß die Frage der Titulatur im diplomatischen Verkehr zwischen beiden Reichen eine Rolle gespielt hat⁴³. Das aber ist nicht entscheidend. Für die Entwicklung der Kaiseridee in Deutschland und vielleicht auch in Byzanz mag es eine, möglicherweise wichtige, Rolle gespielt haben. Entscheidend in unserem Zusammenhang ist die Frage, ob das Zweikaiserproblem die Außenpolitik des byzantinischen Reiches im 12. Jahrhundert beeinflußt hat oder nicht. Oder mit anderen Worten: Sind politische Aktionen oder Reaktionen der byzantinischen Kaiser während des 12. Jahrhunderts überwiegend oder auch nur geringfügig durch das "Zweikaiserproblem" verursacht oder, wenigstens teilweise, motiviert worden? Diese Frage ist, wie ich glaube, eindeutig zu verneinen. Weder die Verhandlungen des Alexios noch die des Johannes mit dem Papsttum noch die Unternehmungen Manuels in den sechziger Jahren sind durch das "Zweikaiserproblem" verursacht beeinflußt oder modifiziert worden. In allen drei Fällen spielt es, ebenso wie übrigens die Kirchenunion, nicht mehr als die Rolle einer Waffe, die eingesetzt

⁴² Daß Friedrich 1172 Befürchtungen äußerte, die Griechen wollten ihm die "corona imperii" wegnehmen, ist zwar für die Situation der sechziger Jahre treffend, 1172 aber ist es bereits überholt und, worauf Kahl, Krönungspläne S. 290 und S. 302 zu Recht aufmerksam gemacht hat, nichts anderes als ein Propagandamittel des deutschen Kaisers, um die deutschen Fürsten von der Notwendigkeit eines weiteren Italienfeldzugs zu überzeugen.

⁴³ cf. hierzu vor allem den treffenden Aufsatz von Ohnsorge, "Kaiser" Konrad III. passim.

wird, wenn es von Nutzen zu sein scheint. Ist solches nicht der Fall, bleiben sowohl "Zweikaiserproblem" als auch Kirchenunion im Arsenal unerledigter und nicht aktueller Probleme, deren Lösung auf später verschoben wird, sei es daß die Situation dann günstiger sein oder die Möglichkeit, diese Waffen wieder in einem politisch diplomatischen Manöver einzusetzen, sich als sinnvoll erweisen könnte.

Man unterschätzt hier vielleicht das Selbstbewußtsein der Byzantiner. Der byzantinische Kaiser war nicht ein Kaiser von mehreren, sondern er war — durch die direkte und ununterbrochene Nachfolge seiner Vorgänger bis hin zu Augustus — der römische Kaiser. Einen anderen gab es nicht. Der deutsche König mochte versuchen, diesen Titel zu usurpieren, und er mochte im westlichen Abendland damit sogar Erfolg haben. Für einen Byzantiner war und blieb sein Anspruch lächerlich: ärgerlich zwar, aber eben doch lächerlich. Byzanz hatte es, seinem eigenen Selbstverständnis zufolge, nicht nötig, seinen eigenen Anspruch zu verteidigen oder anderen gegenüber durchzusetzen. Es war kein Anspruch. Es war die Realität. Das hieß nicht, daß man nicht verärgert reagierte, wenn ein "Barbar", wie der deutsche König es in byzantinischen Augen war, sich den Titel eines "Imperator Romanorum" anmaßte und sich vom Papst — für einen Byzantiner wiederum lächerlich⁴⁴ — salben und krönen ließ. Ebenso wenig ließ man es sich nehmen, den Emporkömmling entsprechend zurechtzuweisen, aber die eigene Politik wurde durch solche Fragen nicht bestimmt. Die Tatsachen waren bekannt. Sie brauchten nicht mit Gewalt durchgesetzt zu werden. Irgendwann würde der "Barbar" schon zur Vernunft kommen und wenn nicht, dann würde man weitersehen. Aber das lag in der Zukunft. Für die Gegenwart und die aktuellen Probleme war es nicht so wichtig.

⁴⁴ cf. etwa Kinnamos S. 219f.; die Quellenangaben ließen sich mühelos vermehren.

Es mag sein, daß es in Deutschland anders gewesen ist. Das deutsche Kaisertum war das jüngere. Schon dies machte es angreifbar, und die Erringung des Kaisertitels war an die Romfahrt geknüpft und an die Zustimmung des Papstes gebunden, was es gleichfalls gefährdeter erscheinen ließ als das in sich selbst gegründete Kaisertum der Griechen. Zudem verbanden sich mit dem Kaisertum in Deutschland auch gewisse religiöse, endzeitliche Vorstellungen, so daß sich hieraus vielleicht erklärt, daß die deutschen Kaiser — bezeichnenderweise besonders Konrad III., der nur König, aber nie Kaiser war — der Frage des Titels wesentlich empfindlicher gegenübergestanden haben als ihre byzantinischen Konkurrenten. Aber auch sie waren realistisch genug, sich hiervon in ihrer Politik nicht oder doch kaum beeinflussen zu lassen. Gerade unter Konrad III. finden wir die Periode der intensivsten Verbindungen zwischen beiden Reichen, und zwar für die Gesamtzeit der Verbindungen zwischen östlichem und westlichem Kaisertum überhaupt. Man sollte die Wirksamkeit unterschiedlicher ideologischer Positionen auf die tatsächlich betriebene Politik nicht überschätzen. Sie entspricht meist nicht dem Getöse, das — häufig aus Propagandagründen — um sie veranstaltet wird. Und das gilt nicht nur für Byzanz und auch nicht nur für das mittelalterliche Deutschland.

THE ROLE OF THE GREAT ISTHMUS CORRIDOR IN THE SLAVONIC INVASIONS OF GREECE*

JOHN ROSSER / Chestnut Hill, MA.

The period of the Slavonic invasions in Greece, a period roughly from Justinian's reign until the early ninth century,¹ a period of

* This article is a slightly expanded and modified version of a paper delivered at the American Historical Association Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, December 28-30, 1981. The corridor in question is a direct route south from the Malian to the Corinthian Gulfs, between Vardhates in the north and Itea in the south. It passes behind the coastal defenses at Thermopylae. In recent years this corridor has been investigated by a team from Loyola University of Chicago, directed by Professor Edward W. Kase. The author has been a member of this expedition since 1979.

¹ Massive Slavonic invasions did not begin until after the reign of Justinian. However in the *Anecdota* 18.20 it is reported that Greece ("Hellas") was overrun every year by the Huns, Sclavens and Antae from the beginning of Justinian's reign. The term "Hellas" has been shown to mean roughly the regions south of Thermopylae; see P. Charanis, "Hellas in the Greek Sources of the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Centuries," *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend*, ed. K. Weitzmann (Princeton, 1955), 161-176, reprinted in study XV of P. Charanis, *Studies on the Demography of the Byzantine Empire*, Collected Studies 8 (London, Variorum Reprints, 1972).

The reconquest of Greece did not begin until the reign of Nicephorus I, when in 810 the Peloponnesus was reconquered. See P. Charanis "Nicephorus I, The Savior of Greece from the Slavs (810 A.D.)," *Byzantina-Metabyzantina*, 1 (1946), 75-92, reprinted in *Studies on the Demography*, XIII.

almost three centuries, saw most of Greece inundated with Slavs. The greatest invasions were between 578 and 585,² and when they were over the Slavs had settled in every region of Greece, particularly around Trikkala, in the northern Epirus and in the mountainous interior of the Peloponnesus.³

Historical texts for this period are meagre and controversial.⁴ For the region of the Great Isthmus Corridor, Thermopylae is occasionally mentioned but otherwise the historical sources are silent.⁵ We must depend mostly on the location of Slavonic place names,⁶ also on archaeological evidence. Much of the latter has been newly created by Phokis-Doris archaeological reconnaissance. However the combined evidence does allow us to speculate about the corri-

² The sources are Menander, Evagrius and John of Ephesus, discussed in P. Charanis, "Observations on the History of Greece during the Early Middle Ages," *Balkan Studies*, 11 (1970), 15; reprinted in *Studies on the Demography*, XXI. See also A.P. Vlasto, *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom* (Cambridge, 1970), 4-5.

³ See P. Charanis, "Observations," 22-23. Charanis relies on the work of M. Vasmer, *Die Slaven in Griechenland* (Berlin, 1941), 317.

⁴ Among the most important is the *Chronicle of Monemvasia*, discussed by P. Charanis in "The Chronicle of Monemvasia and the Question of the Slavonic Settlements in Greece," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 5 (1950), 141-166; reprinted in *Studies on the Demography*, X. Other sources are considered in Charanis, "Hellas," and "Observations."

⁵ For mention of Thermopylae in the historical sources, see P. Charanis, "Hellas," 162-163.

⁶ For Phokis, Vasmer lists 45 Slavonic place names. For Phthiotis he lists 55. See Vasmer, 102-108 and 113-118.

dor's use. We must only be careful not to allow speculation to get too far ahead of what is known. In other words caution is the keynote.⁷

The questions we must ask are simple ones: 1.) did the Slavs use the corridor as a means of access to the Peloponnesus?; 2.) did they settle in the corridor?; and finally, 3.) did the imperial government defend the corridor with fortifications and garrisons? First, did the Slavs use the corridor as a means of access to the Peloponnesus? That they could have done so is obvious from the accessibility of the corridor for communications and settlement during all major periods of history (and prehistory). This general fact has been demonstrated by the expedition's work. Moreover there is the statement by Procopius about an attack on Thermopylae in 539 by Huns who:

...plundered Illyricum and Thessaly and attempted to storm the wall at Thermopylae; but since the guards on the walls defended them most valiantly, they sought out ways around and unexpectedly found the path which leads up the mountain which rises there. In this way they destroyed almost all the Greeks except the Peloponnesians, and then withdrew.⁸

⁷ Our expedition uncovered no archaeological evidence of the Slavs within the corridor. Throughout Greece, of course, the *non*-presence of the Slavs in the archaeological record, except by inference, is a phenomenon not sufficiently understood. The Slavonic cremation burials at Olympia are exceptional; see *Archaeiologikon Deltion* (1961-1962), 106. Given the circumstances, it is important not to exaggerate or even misuse the little evidence, including literary texts, which does exist. For further comment on this, see J. Rosser, "A Research Strategy for Byzantine Archaeology," *Byzantine Studies / Études Byzantines*, 6 (1979), 152-155.

⁸ Procopius, *The Persian War*, II.4, H.B. Dewing translation (Loeb Classical Library). Procopius calls them Huns, but Theophanes calls them Bulgars. See Theophanes, *Chronographia*, edited by C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1883), I, p. 217.

There are, of course, many paths behind Thermopylae by which the coastal defenses there can be bypassed. However, Paul W. Wallace, Associate Director of our expedition, has demonstrated that the path which uses the entrance to our corridor is the only path which can safely transport a body of troops around those coastal defenses.⁹ If the Huns took this route in 539, it could have been used by Slavs as well during their invasions of the late sixth century.

Recently Koder has pointed out that in the tenth century *Chronicle of Galaxeidi* there is a report of Bulgars having attacked Amphisso (Salona) and Galaxeidi in order to get ships to transport them to the Peloponnesus. Koder rightly comments that the land route the Bulgars took (evidently our Great Isthmus Corridor) could have been used earlier, in the same fashion, by the Slavs.¹⁰

Moreover, Koder believes that the heavy concentration of Slavonic place names around ports between Naupaktos and Itea must indicate that most Slavs preferred the direct route to the Peloponnesus, avoiding urban centers like Thebes and Athens to the east, where potential armed resistance lay.¹¹ In other words, what the Huns seemed unable to do in 539, namely cross the Gulf of Corinth, the Slavs were able to do once they gained what must have been permanent access to port facilities.

⁹ Paul W. Wallace, "The Anopaia Path at Thermopylai," *American Journal of Archaeology*, 84 (1980), 14-23, especially 23.

¹⁰ J. Koder, "Zur Frage der Slavischen Siedlungsgebiete im Mittelalterlichen Griechenland," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 71 (1978), 322.

¹¹ *Ibid.* However, Koder's belief in Hood's "isles of refuge" theory has recently been challenged by T. Gregory, in a paper delivered at the 82nd General Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, 30 December 1980. See S. Hood, "Isles of Refuge in the Early Byzantine Period," *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 68 (1973), 37-45.

Some Slavs must have settled in the corridor, although Slavonic toponyms in Phokis and Phthiotis are relatively few (45 and 55 respectively) as compared to farther north around Trikkala and Karditsa (122).¹² One great stream of Slavs must have moved from the latter towns west into Epirus. Another stream moved south, mostly taking the Great Isthmus Corridor as a direct route into the Peloponnesus. Some must have settled along the way at Vardhates, Gravia and Varyiani — all Slavonic place names mentioned by Vasmer.¹³

¹² See Vasmer, 86-99, 102-108, and 113-118.

¹³ For Vardhates and Gravia, see *Ibid.*, 103 and 115 respectively. Gravia is discussed by J. Koder - F. Hild, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini, Band I, Hellas und Thessalia* (Wien, 1976), 167. Varyiani is also mentioned by Vasmer, 114.

There are other place names within the corridor which would seem to be Slavonic, since the same names are recorded by Vasmer for locations elsewhere in Greece: Vininani (Vasmer, 81 and 179), Rhakhita (Vasmer, 187) and Zirelia (Vasmer, 63). Of course the Slavs could have moved against the Isthmus of Corinth, as indeed the Huns could have in 539. The isthmus was fortified by Justinian, as reported by Procopius in *On the Buildings*, IV.2, but we are not told when. These fortifications have been studied by H. Megaw, "On the Date of the Fortifications of Corinth," *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 32 (1931/1932), 69-79, but no precise date in Justinian's reign is offered. For a view that the isthmus fortifications existed in 539 and that they stopped the Huns, see H. Schläger-D.J. Blackman - J. Schäfer, "Der Hafen von Anthedon," *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 83 (1968), 93. However P. Charanis believes the isthmus was fortified only after 539. See "The Chronicle of Monemvasia," 162. A post-539 date is also accepted by J. Koder-F. Hild, 53. If the post-539 date is correct, it makes it more likely that the dead-end for the Huns was in fact the end of our corridor where, in the absence of boats to transport them across the Gulf of Corinth, they turned back.

Did the imperial government attempt to defend the corridor? Here again the answer is affirmative. At the Dhema Gap, at the very entrance of the corridor, there are two cross-walls which have been studied by William J. Cherf¹⁴ of our expedition. The first wall is anchored on a small hill on its east side, and to the west it climbs up the Petseta area of Mt. Oiti.¹⁵ The latest pottery recovered from test trenching near the wall is a coarseware with incised lines, often wavy, similar to sherds recovered elsewhere in Greece and dated to the Justinianic era.¹⁶ Recent radiocarbon 14 analysis of the lime

¹⁴ I am grateful to Mr. Cherf, a staff member of the Phokis-Doris Expedition, for the information he has given me. His dissertation-in-progress is entitled *The Dhema Gap: A Historical, Topographical, and Archaeological Study of an Early Byzantine Fortification in Central Greece* (Department of History, Loyola University of Chicago).

¹⁵ The hill was first described by J. Farrell, "Note on the Position of Rhoduntia," *Classical Review*, 24 (1910), 117. There was formerly a mosque there, hence Farrell's term the "Jami Rock." The wall, as it encloses the Jami Rock, is preserved to 0.55-3.0 m. in height and is from 1.10-1.55 m. in width. A portion of the wall was destroyed by bulldozing done for the modern mining road. However, on the western side of the mining road the wall is preserved. After almost paralleling the road for ca. 100 m., the wall turns sharply and ascends the western slopes of Mt. Oiti's Petseta region until it ends at the ridge of a steep ravine. The wall is of rubble construction. This information was supplied by Mr. Cherf.

¹⁶ Such pottery has been recovered at Corinth, Anthedon and Tiryns. For Corinth, see O. Broneer, *Hesperia*, 28 (1959), 336, nos. 15, 16 and plate 72a, b. For Anthedon, see H. Schläger-D. J. Blackman-J. Schäfer, 87, Fig. 88. For Tiryns, see *Tiryns. Forschungen und Berichte*, V (Mainz am Rhein, 1971), 102, and plate 44, no. 31.

mortar in this wall has produced dates prior to Justinian's reign.¹⁷ The wall, then, was initially constructed before 527, but its use continued into that emperor's reign. The wall may have been abandoned with the onset of massive Slavonic migrations in the late sixth century.

The remains of a second cross-wall exist about 300 m. south of the first wall. A branch of the Xirias River flows by this wall, suggesting the possibility that the wall might be one mentioned by Procopius in connection with the Justinianic fortification of Myropoles.¹⁸

It is interesting that in Procopius' account of the Hunnic raid of 539, there is no mention that the route which the Huns took was guarded at all.¹⁹ This could simply be an oversight by Procopius, although it could also mean that the defenses included no permanent garrison. In any case the defenses were overrun. After 539, Justinian refortified land defenses in central Greece. The radiocarbon dates from the first wall at Dhema seem to suggest that this fortification was not included in Justinian's plans.²⁰

¹⁷ Six dates have been produced by the Radiocarbon Laboratory, Balcones Research Center, at the University of Texas at Austin. All are from the mid-4th century A.D. to the mid-5th century A.D. This information was supplied by personal communication from William J. Cherf, October 18, 1981.

¹⁸ This cross-wall was first seen in low-level aerial photographs. For its identification with Myropoles, see W.J. Cherf, "A Justinian Fortification Near Thermopylae," *Abstracts of Papers from the Seventh Annual Byzantine Studies Conference*, Boston University, November 13-15, 1981, 8. See also P.A. MacKay, "Procopius' *De Aedificiis* and the Topography of Thermopylae," *American Journal of Archaeology*, 67 (1963), 250.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 251.

²⁰ On Justinian's program of refortification, see H. Schläger - D.J. Blackman - J. Schäfer, 92-94. After this Hunnic raid the coastal defenses at Thermopylae were refortified and supplied with a permanent garrison; see Procopius, *On the Buildings*, IV. 2, 2-15. See also the *Anecdota*, 26, 30-34.

Ultimately the wall at Dhema was meant to work in tandem with that natural Gibraltar of central Greece, Kastro Orias. The latter is just 3.4 km. to the south of Dhema and has a tower at its NW corner. Kolias speculated that the tower might be of Justinianic date.²¹ There are cisterns and terrace walls at the citadel top that indicate it was used for farming. It is certainly possible that local farmers, perhaps a small garrison responsible for keeping watch over the entrance to the corridor, resided there. Certainly there must have been a farming community between Dhema and Kastro Orias at the largest site in the north sector of the corridor: Kouvela. Kouvela is one of the most fertile areas in all of Greece and must have been farmed almost continuously since ancient times.²²

Only occasionally do the historical sources speak of garrison troops guarding Justinianic fortifications. It is doubtful there were any at Dhema or Kastro Orias. Mostly Justinian depended on local farmers, serving as a kind of peasant militia, to defend his walls and

²¹ G. Kolias, "Siderokastro," *Epetèris Etaireias Byzantinōn Soudōn*, 10 (1933), 79-82. MacKay, 67, thinks it possible that Kastro Orias might be Procopius' Myro-poles. The tower, if it is of Justinianic date, could have been built after the Hunnic attack of 539. However as a cautionary note, one should be careful about assigning fortifications behind Thermopylae to Justinian, just because we happen to know more in general about Justinian's interest in that area. Usually all one can say for sure is that the many walls there are "post-classical." On this see HM Schläger - D.J. Blackman - J. Schäfer, 95.

²² Kouvela is the largest site (ca. 1500 m. E-W by ca. 500 m. N-S) in the north sector of the corridor.

forts in the Balkan Peninsula (more than 600 total!). It has been argued recently that Justinian's fortifications failed precisely because of insufficient garrison troops to man these defenses.²³

From the tower atop Kastro Orias, some 200 m. above Kouvela and some 400 m. above the headwaters of the Asopus River, one commands a view of the entire surrounding area: to the north the Malian Plain up to Lamia, to the east the Asopus River gorge and Mt. Kallidromos, and to the south the continuation of the Great Isthmus Corridor. The advantage of such a view is measured by time, the time it gave to sound an alarm, to transport families and livestock to the top of Kastro Orias and to organize the defense at Dhema. In the event of a defeat Dhema, Kastro Orias became a final redoubt.

Of course the defences failed. This seems obvious from the account of the 539 Hunnic raid, a raid we believe made use of the corridor. But ultimately the failure of the Dhema defenses was due to numbers, not walls: the Slavs were just too numerous and the defenders too few. Thus the corridor was opened to the Slavs as a gateway to southern Greece.

²³ F.E. Wozniak, "The Justinianic Fortifications in Illyricum: Was Refortification the Answer to Barbarian Raids?," *Abstracts of Papers, Fifth Annual Byzantine Studies Conference, Dumbarton Oaks, October 26-28, 1979*, 44-45. On p. 44 Wozniak writes this: "The forts, which were in large part no more than places of refuge for the local population, do not seem to have been adequately manned if they had a garrison at all; most of the forts do not appear to have had any garrison." In closing we should only remark that the Dhema Gap, serving as it does as a kind of bottleneck at the beginning of the Great Isthmus Corridor, could have deterred a large invading force: if the defenses were adequately manned. However, there is no mention in any literary source that it was garrisoned, and the excavated remains at first analysis seem insufficient to make such a claim. In other words, Wozniak's general comments about Justinian's failure to provide garrison troops for refortifications may also apply to Dhema as well.

THE CRISIS OF BYZANTINE ECCLESIASTICAL FOUNDATIONS, 964-1025

JOHN PHILIP THOMAS / WASHINGTON

Practically every important figure in Byzantine society saw fit to devote some personal resources to one or more religious foundations during the course of a secular or ecclesiastical career. Moreover, it is remarkable how often deposed emperors, retired patriarchs, and courtiers in disgrace chose to withdraw to live out their lives in their *pre-existing* proprietary religious foundations. Surely such a favored institution as the private ecclesiastical foundation deserves more attention than it has received hitherto, and I believe that it provides the key to the resolution of several of the difficult problems of Byzantine historiography. This present study will utilize an analysis of the crisis faced by these foundations in the late tenth century in an attempt to view some old problems in a new light.¹

With his well-known law of 964,² Emperor Nicephorus Phocas

¹ This study is a condensed excerpt from my unpublished doctoral dissertation, *The Proprietary Church System in the Byzantine Empire* (Harvard University, 1980), presented as a paper at the Seventh Annual Byzantine Studies Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, 1981. In its present form, the study has had the considerable benefit of a critical reading by Dr. Alexander Kazhdan, yet the views presented are my own. I have employed standard abbreviations in the notes. Post-Justinianic legal references are to K. E. Zacharia von Lingenthal, *Jus graecoromanum* (Leipzig, 1856-84) = *JGR*. Canonical citations are to G.A. Rhalles and M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων* (Athens, 1852-9) = *R&P*.

² Nicephorus Phocas, *Novella de monasteriis* (964), *JGR* 3.292-6 = Dölger, *Re-*

(963-969) assumed the formidable task of reversing traditional patterns of lay philanthropy dating back to the origins of private religious institutions in the fourth century A.D. He realized astutely that the typical benefactor of a religious foundation had a certain amount of vanity mixed in with the higher motives which led a patron to devote a considerable part of his or her wealth to a charitable cause. The allure and prestige of the title of *κτίστης*, the founder, insured that benefactors who could afford it would prefer to found a new church or monastery of their own rather than assist an old one with much-needed repairs and capital improvements.³

The result of this predisposition was that the empire became home to an ever-increasing number of religious foundations, far in excess of any reasonable standard of need. While newer foundations might enjoy prosperity rivaling that of the landed magnates, many other institutions fell into serious financial trouble or physical decay for lack of capable management or of sufficient funds for repairs.

The problem of providing for the repair of dilapidated religious foundations existed even in Justinian's day, and conscientious bis-

gesten No. 699; cf. John Scylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum*, ed. J. Thurn, *CFHB* (Berlin, 1973), p. 274, and John Zonaras, *Epitome historiarum* 16.25, ed. L. Dindorf (Leipzig, 1868-75).

³ Nicephorus Phocas, *Novella* (964), *JGR* 3.294.25-34; cf. John Chrysostom, *In acta apostolorum homilium XVIII*, *PG* 60, col. 148, lines 16-22, and Justinian, *NJ* 67.2 (538).

hops of the mid-ninth century had also been aware of its seriousness.⁴ These prelates had appropriated the residual assets of some older foundations and employed diocesan funds to carry out complete restorations. Some overzealous bishops pursued these projects with such enthusiasm that the finances of their own dioceses became endangered. Mindful of this problem, the Council of Constantinople decided in 861 to prohibit the use of diocesan funds for any more restorations of private foundations, failing thereby to confront the fundamental problem of arranging for the future well-being of these institutions.

Just as John Chrysostom had suggested centuries earlier, Nicephorus Phocas recommended in his law that wealthy benefactors should henceforth sell properties they would otherwise have donated to new foundations, and to give the proceeds to the poor instead.⁵ He commanded those benefactors who were not attracted to this sort of charity to turn their attentions to the ruined and dilapidated foundations, which badly needed financial assistance

⁴ NJ 67.2 (538); *C. Const. I et II* (861), c. 7 (R&P 2. 673.19 - 674.1): Πολλὰς τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν ὁρῶμεν καταπιπτούσας, καὶ ἀφανισμῷ τελείῳ κινδυνευούσας παραδίδοσθαι, ὅτι περ οἱ τούτων προεστηκότες τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν φροντίδα καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν εἰς νεουργίας μοναστηρίων καταναλίσκουσι· καὶ ταύτας διασπώντες, καὶ τὸν σφετερισμὸν τῶν εἰσόδων ἐκμηχανώμενοι, τὴν ἐκείνων ἐπαύξησιν πραγματεύονται. Ὡρῖσεν οὖν διὰ τοῦτο ἡ ἀγία σύνοδος, μηδενὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐξεῖναι, μοναστήριον ἰδίον ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῆς οἰκείας ἐπισκοπῆς νεουργεῖν. Εἰ δέ τις φωραθῇ τοῦτο τολμῶν, αὐτὸν μὲν τῷ προσήκοντι ἐπιτιμίῳ καθυποβάλλεσθαι· τὸ δὲ νεουργηθὲν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὥς μὴδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν μοναστηρίου δίκαιον ἀπειληφὸς, ὥς ἰδιόκτητον τῷ ἐπισκοπεῖῳ προσκυροῦσθαι.

⁵ JGR 3.295.5-11; cf. John Chrysostom, *In Matthaeum homilium L*, PG 58, col. 509.

for repairs and capital improvements. These institutions were then to use the benefactors' money to acquire field hands and livestock in order to put their current properties to better use. In the emperor's opinion, these institutions were incapable, in their current condition, of managing any more gifts of land without adequate capital, much less of operating them at maximum efficiency.

Why had so many monasteries come to possess such extensive properties so notably deficient in capital assets? The sources provide no ready answer, but it is clear that these troubled institutions either no longer had the assistance of their traditional lay benefactors, or else these patrons now lacked the resources to care for them.

Some monastic foundations had always enjoyed their own independent property endowments, and since the late eighth century, the practice of patrons providing landed endowments for religious foundations had become increasingly common.⁶ Still, the Council of Constantinople had found it necessary in 861 to issue a canon buttressing the autonomy of privately founded monasteries against the attempts of benefactors to treat these institutions according to the old fashion as undifferentiated personal property.⁷ The really

⁶ *C. Chalc.* (451), c. 24 (R&P 2.271), *C. Trull.* (692), c. 49 (R&P 2.423), and *C. Nicaen. II* (787), c. 12 (R&P 2.592-3) imply the early existence of landed endowments for some monasteries. Numerous *exempla* from the hagiographic literature, e.g., *Vita S. Joannis Psichaitae*, ed. I. Van den Ven, *Le Muséon* n.s. 3 (1902) 110, *Vita S. Philareti eleemosynarii*, ed. M. Fourmy and M. Leroy, *Byzantion* 9 (1934) 155, 157, and *Synaxarium S. Nicetae*, ed. D. Papachryssanthou, *Travaux et Mémoires* 3 (1968) 325, testify to the popularity of granting specific endowments of landed property to religious institutions by the late eighth century.

⁷ *C. Const. I et II* (861), c. 1 (R&P 2.648-9); cf. Nicholas Mysticus, *Epist.* 123 (914-8), ed. R. J. H. Jenkins and L. G. Westerink, *CFHB* (Washington, D. C., 1973).

novel element of the council's legislation, however, was the requirement that benefactors were to provide a specific record of properties with which they proposed to endow their foundations.⁸

Possibly many patrons bound by the council's regulation assigned only the properties necessary to make their foundations appear viable, but withheld cultivators and livestock (as one prominent benefactor had done in Byzantine Egypt in the sixth century) in order to ensure that they could continue to exercise personal management and exploitation of these properties.⁹ Private foundations endowed this way might well have been left with plenty of land, but no means to exploit it, upon the eventual demise of their patrons' families.

⁸ Canon 1 (R&P 2.649.6-15): "Ὡρισεν οὖν διὰ ταῦτα ἡ ἀγία σύνοδος, μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι μοναστήριον οἰκοδομεῖν ἄνευ τῆς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου γνώμης καὶ βουλῆς. Ἐκείνου δὲ συνειδότος, καὶ ἐπιτρέποντος, καὶ τὴν ὀφειλομένην ἐπιτελοῦντος εὐχὴν, ὡς τοῖς πάλαι θεοφιλῶς νενομοθέτηται, οἰκοδομεῖσθαι μὲν τὸ μοναστήριον, πάντα δὲ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ προσήκοντα, σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκείνῳ, βρεβίῳ ἐγκαταγράφεσθαι, καὶ τοῖς ἐπισκοπικοῖς ἀρχείοις ἐναποτίθεσθαι· μηδαμῶς ἄδειαν ἔχοντος τοῦ ἀφιερῶντος, παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἑαυτὸν ἡγούμενον, ἢ ἀνθ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἕτερον καθιστᾶν.

⁹ For such a withholding, see Count Ammonius, known from his surviving estate registers for the years 529-31, ed. Jean Maspéro, *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Papyrus grecs d' époque byzantine* (Cairo, 1911-6), Nos. 67138-9. I am preparing a paper detailing the means by which this benefactor provided support to a private religious institution.

How did these institutions lose their original patrons and become effectively independent institutions? Until the general adoption of landed endowments, private religious institutions followed the rest of a patron's property when he bequeathed, donated or sold it to another proprietor.¹⁰ Occasions inevitably arose, however, when the family line died out, or some other misfortune struck, after which there was no one to assume the traditional role of protector for a religious foundation.¹¹

In the best of circumstances, some responsible party, perhaps the local bishop or the ecclesiastical official whose predecessor had originally granted the σταυροπήγιον or charter of foundation for the institution, might step in and arrange for its administration on a new basis as a diocesan, metropolitan, or patriarchal monastery.¹² Indeed, many of the constituent units of the public system of religious institutions administered by the ecclesiastical hierarchy were former private foundations.¹³ At worst, a troubled foundation might be left to fend for itself, the fate of many institutions since the Council of Constantinople's decision preventing bishops from restoring independent monasteries with diocesan funds.

¹⁰ This seems clear from *CJ* 1.5.10 (466-72?), *NJ* 131.14. 1-2 (545), and from papyrological sources, e.g., Maspero, *Papyrus grecs*, No. 67097, A. C. Johnson *et al.*, *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*, Vol. 3 (Princeton, N.J., 1942), No. 180, and F. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten*, Vol. 1 (Strassburg, 1915), No. 5174 (512 A.D.); see also Eustathios Rhomaïos, *Peira* 15.4, *JGR* 1.43, as quoted below in note 18.

¹¹ Evident from numerous examples in the hagiographic literature, e.g., *Vita S. Petri Atroae*, ed. V. Laurent, *Subsidia Hagiographica* 29 (1956) 89, which mention abandoned religious foundations.

¹² As happened in the late tenth century, when bishops and metropolitans intervened to rescue small monasteries founded by peasant communities (see below, p. 15). For σταυροπήγια, see Placide De Meester, *De monachico statu iuxta disciplinam byzantinam* (Vatican City, 1942), pp. 102-3, and Gerardo Oesterle, "De monasterio stauropégiaco", *Il Diritto Ecclesiastico* 54 (1953) 450-60.

¹³ E.g., the foundations restored in contravention of *C. Const. I et II* (861), c. 7 (quoted above in note 3), and the small monasteries founded by peasant communities taken over by the ecclesiastical hierarchy (as discussed below).

In the absence of capital resources, the lot of these institutions must have been extremely difficult. Canon and civil law prevented them from alienating existing property in order to raise capital.¹⁴ Legal restrictions imposed in the tenth century on the purchase of property by religious institutions kept the foundations from enlarging their endowments as a means of securing increased revenues.¹⁵ Moreover, since these foundations lacked patrons, they no longer enjoyed the usual financial benefits of private institutions closely associated with their benefactors. Even the bishops were under strict orders not to provide assistance. The traditions of private philanthropy made it unlikely that any new benefactors unrelated to the original patrons would come to their rescue either. Until Nicephorus Phocas' law, it must have seemed that these institutions were doomed to slow decay and ultimate dissolution.

The emperor had made an accurate diagnosis of the problem, but his remedy was not only drastic but also ineffective. He neglected to provide a financial incentive for the restorer of a foundation to replace the traditional rights and monetary compensation he or she would have obtained as the patron of a new institution.¹⁶ Moreover, it was to become clear that it was not necessary to pay the high price of foregoing all new foundations in order to aid the

¹⁴ For the canonical prohibitions, see references above in note 6; legal prohibitions: *CJ* 1.2.14 (470), *CJ* 1.2.17 (491-518), *CJ* 1.2.21 (529), *NJ* 7 (535), *NJ* 46 (536), and *NJ* 120 (544).

¹⁵ Romanus I Lecapenus, *Novella de potentibus* (934), *JGR* 3.242-52 = Dölger, *Regesten* No. 628; Constantine VII, *Novella de potentibus* (947), *JGR* 3.252-6 = Dölger, *Regesten* No. 656.

¹⁶ For the traditional perquisites of the founders of religious institutions, see Josef von Zhishman, *Das Stifterrecht in der morgenländischen Kirche* (Vienna, 1888), pp. 47-64.

existing troubled institutions. It was Emperor Basil II (976-1025) who recognized the mistake and repealed the law.¹⁷ The text of Basil's law is extant, and though its authenticity is not above reproach, its precise dating to April 4, 988 in the difficult period just before the emperor's victory at Abydos, accords well with circumstances which may have stimulated a cost-free gesture of this sort for the gratification of the magnates whose support he so desperately needed. Moreover, the policy reflected in this law is not necessarily inconsistent with Basil's later legislation, unless one believes that a fanatical anti-aristocratic bias is a pervasive, invariable cha-

¹⁷ Basil II, *Novella quae legem Nicephori de monasteriis tollit* (988), *JGR* 3.303-4; condemned as a forgery by Dölger, *Regesten* No. 772 and others. Opponents of authenticity prefer to follow a late scholiast on Nicephorus Phocas' law (*Cod. Vindob. Supplem.* 47-8, reproduced in *JGR* 3.292, n. 1), who attributes the repeal to John Tzimisces. I prefer to follow Peter Charanis, "Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 4 (1948) 61, n. 23, and V. G. Vasilievsky, "Materialy dlya vnutrennei istorii Vizantiiskago gosudarstva", *ZMNP* 202 (1879) 228-30, who argue for authenticity.

racteristic of imperial policy throughout his entire reign.

A legal case decided by Basil II gives independent confirmation of his sympathy with the concerns of private benefactors.¹⁸ Patriarch Nicholas II Chrysoberges (980-992) attempted to assert control over a monastery called Piperatos (location unknown), perhaps on the basis of a patriarchal σταυροπήγιον. When the dispute came to the emperor, he upheld the property rights of the owners of this monastery.

Earlier patriarchs had moved successfully to take over old private foundations in order to rebuild or restore them. Photius had rebuilt the monastery of the *magistros* Manuel at Constantinople in the mid-ninth century, and Theophylact (933-956) had restored the monastery of Rufinus at Chrysopolis, one of the oldest private foundations.¹⁹ Since 861, the patriarchs could do this only by finding a way to circumvent the standing prohibition on the employ-

¹⁸ Eustathios Rhomaïos, *Peira* 15.4, *JGR* 1.43: "Ὅτι ἡ μονὴ τοῦ Πιπεράτου ἐξ ἀρχῆς οἶκος ἦν κοσμικοῦ τινος, ὃς ἐδωρήθη εὐλαβεῖ τινι μοναχῷ, καὶ οὕτως σεμνεῖον τοῦτο ποιήσας τῷ κυρῷ Ῥωμανῷ τῷ γέροντι πρὸ τοῦ βασιλεῦσαι δέδωκε. καὶ οὗτος μετὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ μέγα αὐτὴν ἐπῆρε καὶ Μαριανῷ πρωτοδεστιάριῳ ὄντι ταύτην δέδωκε, οἷον καὶ αὐτὴν καὶ τοὺς αὐτῆς ὡς βούλεται καὶ ἐφεξῆς. ὕστερον δὲ ὁ πατριάρχης κύρος Νικόλαος ἐζήτηι τὴν μονὴν ἐπὶ τὰ πατριαρχικά δίκαια ὑποποιήσασθαι. ὁ δὲ κρίνων βασιλεὺς καὶ δικαστὴς ἐσημειώσατο, μὴ δικαίως λέγειν τὸν πατριάρχην· οὐ γὰρ εὗρέθη ἡ μονὴ ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑπογεγραμμένη· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκώλυσαν τὸν πατριάρχην, εἰποντες ὅτι καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν κανόνων καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν νόμων ἀπηγόρευται, οὐδὲ ἀφήρηται τὰ τῆς αὐτοδεσπότης ἐξουσίας, ἢ συγκεχωρηται πρὸς ἕτερον ὑπάγεσθαι ἢ ἀπογράφεσθαι ἢ βρεθουσθαι. εἰ δὲ ὡς ἀπὸ ἔθους ἴσως ἔχη ἐν πολλοῖς χώραν ἢ μετὰθεσις ἐκ τῶν διαδόχων παραχωρηθεῖσα τῇ σφῶν ἀνεξικακίᾳ, τὸ παρὰ κανόνα ἢ [κατὰ] πλάνην γεγονὸς οὐ δίκαιον ἡγεῖσθαι κύριον. See the discussion of this document by Emil Herman, "Ricerche sulle istituzioni monastiche bizantine", *OCP* 6 (1940) 343, and by Hélène AHRWEILER, "Charisticariat et autres formes d'attribution de fondations pieuses aux X^e-XI^e siècles", *ZRVI* 10 (1967), 26.

¹⁹ Theodore Balsamon, *Commentaria ad C. Const. I et II*, c. 7 (R&P 2.675).

ment of diocesan funds. Among the ways used to do this were the employment of the prelate's personal resources to meet the costs of renovation (in which case the monastery became the hereditary property of his family), or the transformation of the restored foundation into a public institution. Accordingly, the monastery of Manuel became Photius' private property, which passed after his death to his relative Sergius, later to become one of the patriarchs of Basil II.²⁰ The monastery of Rufinus, however, became a patriarchal institution from the time of Theophylact's restoration.²¹

Perhaps Nicholas Chrysoberges had similar plans for the monastery of Piperatos, but whatever his intentions, he clashed with the owners, who wished to retain control of it for themselves. The proprietors successfully established that their institution was αὐτοδέεσποτον, self-governing, and had never been conceded to an ecclesiastical overlord.

Basil II's decision in this case, and the recent abolition of Nicephorus Phocas' legal incentive for private reconstruction of ruined institutions must have posed a dilemma for the patriarch. The emperor's strict insistence on proof to support alleged patriarchal rights undermined Nicholas Chrysoberges' ability to gain clear title to independent foundations as he was obliged to do in order to observe the canonical restriction on the employment of diocesan funds for reconstruction.

²⁰ Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia* 6.50, ed. I. Bekker, *CSHB* (Bonn, 1838), pp. 433-4.

²¹ This monastery was Theophylact's burial site (a traditional founder's perquisite, see Zhishman, *Stifterrecht*, p. 63), according to Michael Glycas, *Annales*, ed. I. Bekker, *CSHB* (Bonn, 1836), p. 563; later, according to Theodore Scutariotes, *Σύνοψις χρονική*, ed. K.A. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική βιβλιοθήκη*, Vol. 7 (Paris, 1894), p. 182, it became the residence in retirement for Patriarch Eustratius Garidas (1081-84).

The emperors and the ecclesiastical authorities had not always been so scrupulously respectful of the property rights of laymen in ecclesiastical institutions. In 899, Emperor Leo VI (886-912) was preparing to rebuild a monastery which he had confiscated from the disgraced courtier Leo Katokoilas, in order to place it at the disposal of his spiritual director Euthymius.²² Euthymius, later patriarch of Constantinople (907-912), was ignorant of the previous history of this monastery until one of Katokoilas' relatives brought the facts to his attention. The scrupulous Euthymius insisted that Leo VI should recall Katokoilas from exile, pay him a just price for the monastery, and obtain clear title to the property before he would consider accepting the emperor's gift of this institution.

Given the dilemma that faced them after the repeal of Nicephorus Phocas' law, it naturally took concerned contemporaries some time to resolve upon a suitable contractual vehicle which would resolve the conflict between the necessity to respect private property rights and the critical need for the restoration of ecclesiastical institutions. The Piperatos decision gave urgency to the choice of this vehicle, the *χαριστική*.

The *χαριστική* was the keystone of a novel public program, sponsored by the emperor and the ecclesiastical hierarchy, for the private management and restoration of religious institutions.²³ The legal instrument itself was not new. Private individuals, including the emperor and members of the clergy acting in private capacity,

²² *Vita Euthymii patriarchae CP*, ed. P. Karlin-Hayter (Brussels, 1970), p. 29, 31.

²³ Paul Gautier, "Réquisitoire du patriarche Jean d'Antioche contre le charisticariat", *REB* 33 (1975) 77-132, provides at n. 1 a useful, but not exhaustive, bibliography of modern work on the *χαριστική*. Of the various modern works, Ahrweiler, "Charisticariat", *ZRVI* 10 (1967) 1-27, provides the best institutional analysis. Paul Lemerle, "Un aspect du rôle des monastères à Byzance: Les monastères donnés à des laïcs, les charistaires", *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1967, janvier-mars* (Paris, 1967) 9-28 is also very important. Note, as Ahrweiler observes, p. 1, n. 2, that the commonly used term *χαριστήριον* is actually unknown to our sources.

were already free (and indeed had long been accustomed) to donate their foundations as they wished, either conditionally or unconditionally provided that the recipients were not legally disabled, and that the ecclesiastical character of the institutions was preserved.²⁴

Some new way had to be found, however, to determine who would be responsible for making conditional donations of independent, privately-founded institutions to new benefactors. The ecclesiastical hierarchy, now unable to make a κυριαρχικόν δίκαιον, an overlord's right, part of the traditional δίκαια ἐπισκοπικά, bishop's rights, could intervene for administrative purposes only by virtue of their right of ἐπιτήρησις, or oversight.²⁵ Prevented as they were from assuming ownership themselves, the hierarchy could scarcely concede it to others. So the grant of a foundation in χαριστική did not disturb the ultimate rights of ownership over an ecclesiastical institution, but merely separated the rights of management and exploitation for a third party.²⁶ Thus the program was ideally suited to overcome the legal difficulties of arranging for the restoration of ruined ecclesiastical institutions.

²⁴ So *CJ* 1.5.10 (466-72?). Leo VI's donation of the monastery of Katokoilas and Romanus Lecapenus' disposal of the monastery of Píreratos (see above, note 18) provide examples of typical transactions. As A. P. Kazhdan points out in his *Derevnia i gorod v Vizantii IX - X vv.* (Moscow, 1960), p. 107, the term χαριστικής τύπον can be traced back to a lost act of Leo VI = Dölger, *Regesten* No. 512 (ca. 886), which is mentioned in an extant document, *Actes du Prôtaton*, No. 2 (908), ed. D. Papachryssanthou (Paris, 1975), pp. 181-5 = Dölger, *Regesten* No. 514.

²⁵ Cf. Balsamon, *Comm. ad C. Const. I et II*, c. 1 (R&P 2.651.32 - 652.3); Alexius Comnenus, *De jure patriarchae circa monasteria* (1096), *JGR* 3.407-10, esp. 408.7-14 = Dölger, *Regesten* No. 1076, would subsequently confirm the right of patriarchal ἐπιτήρησις at the request of reformers seeking to re-establish effective ecclesiastical control over the beneficiaries of the program.

²⁶ Cf. Ahrweiler, "Charisticariat", p. 6, and Herman, "Ricerche", p. 317.

Under this program, private individuals obtained the management of an institution by appearing to the emperor, who held the rights ownership over imperial foundations, or to the office of the patriarch, metropolitan, or bishop responsible for seeing to the well-being of ecclesiastically-administered and of independent (i.e., private) institutions.²⁷ Again, perhaps an institution's σταυροπήγιον determined the identity of the ecclesiastical official charged with this responsibility.²⁸

Patriarch Nicholas Chrysoberges' use of the program represented an attempt to make the improvement (βελτιώσεις) and maintenance (σύσταισις) of existing institutions financially attractive to private benefactors no longer obliged by Nicephorus Phocas' restrictions on philanthropic donations.²⁹ Perhaps he hoped that the financial rewards possible through a profitable institutional management under the program would serve to narrow the gap between the perceived benefits of erecting a new foundation and those of restor-

²⁷ John V the Oxite, Λόγος περὶ τοῦ διὰ τὰ μοναστήρια διὰ δωρεῶν λαμβάνοντες εἴτε ἀρχιερατικῶν εἴτε βασιλικῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν μοναστηρίων κέρδη ἔχοντες ἀσεβοῦσιν, ed. Gautier, *REB* 33 (1975) 91-131, esp. Ch. 10, lines 278-85, which preserves the formula used in patriarchal and imperial donations; Alexius Studites, *Hypomnema A'* (1027) (R&P 5.21.15-23) indicates the early procedure for obtaining a donation from an ecclesiastical authority.

²⁸ A conjecture, but see the terms of an extant σταυροπήγιον, ed. MM 5.250-2 = Grumel, *Regestes* No. 791, awarded by Patriarch Iolyeuktos (956-970) in 964 to a private patron in Greece for his monastery, which stripped the local ecclesiastical authorities of any rights whatsoever over the foundation. In a case of this sort, would anyone but the stauropegial authority have the legal standing to set up a χαριστική? /P

²⁹ Alexius Studites, *Hypomnema A'* (1027) (R&P 5.20.1-6) preserves the original patriarchal intentions for the program; cf. the comments of John V the Oxite, Λόγος, Ch. 9, ed. Gautier, lines 253-8.

ing an old one. Otherwise, it would have been unrealistic for him to expect that private benefactors, gratified recently by the end of the ban on new foundations, would continue to divert their personal resources for the rebuilding of older institutions.

Basil II, as co-sponsor of the program, employed the *χαριστική* until the end of his long reign in 1025.³⁰ In so doing, he was continuing the practice of donating monasteries to private individuals pioneered by a series of ninth-century emperors. Emperor Nicephorus I (802-811) had conceded the monastery of Chrysonike to the Patrician Nicetas; later, the iconoclast Emperor Leo V (813-820) revoked this grant from the staunchly iconodule nobleman.³¹ Some years later, Emperor Theophilus (829-842) granted the monastery of the Forty Martyrs in Mese at Constantinople to Leo the Philosopher, and awarded a monastery at Chrysopolis to his son-in-law, Caesar Alexius Mousale.³² These administrative delegations of imperial foundations demonstrate that the emperor, like any private individual, enjoyed a free hand in the management of his ecclesiastical property.

Like his predecessors, Basil II used his grants as rewards for individuals who had rendered him valuable service. Now, however, there was the novel feature of obliging the recipients to undertake institutional renovations and reconstruction. Even in this respect, though, the imperial *χαριστική* was not without precedent. The decision of Nicephorus I to have the imperial government take over the management of the better part of the landed endowments of

³⁰ Francisco Trinchera, *Syllabus graecarum membranarum* (Naples, 1865), No. 10 (999), with commentary by Ahrweiler, "Charisticariat", p. 15, n. 82; general statement of Basil II's policy by Balsamon, *Comm. ad. C. Nicaen. II*, c. 13 (R&P 2.614.17-18), quoting Sergius II.

³¹ *Synaxarium S. Nicetae*, Ch. 2, ed. Papachryssanthou, p. 325.

³² Scylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum*, ed. Thurn, p. 103; Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, ed. Bekker, *CSHB* pp. 108-9; Kazhdan, *Derevnia*, pp. 107-8, provides other examples of traditional donations by proprietors.

many categories of religious institutions in 810 was a landmark in the official exploitation of ecclesiastical property, roundly condemned by the chronicler Theophanes, a rich private benefactor who had much to lose under the new arrangements.³³ An inscription of Sisinnius of Tzurulon, an imperial curator, dates from 813, and provides the first indication of institutional renovation taking place under the imperial administration installed by Nicephorus I.³⁴ Two centuries later, this had become a standard feature of the imperial *χαριστική*.

Clearly the *χαριστική* originated and flourished in the tolerant atmosphere of a society long accustomed to private and governmental exploitation of ecclesiastical institutions and properties.³⁵ Yet even at this time there was a notable dissenter to the program, Patriarch Sisinnius II (996-998). He issued a decree which ordered the return of all patriarchal monasteries alienated by his predecessors, either under the *χαριστική* or under the similar (and older) program of *ἐπίδοσις*, the concession of a religious institution from one ecclesiastical authority to another.³⁶ Sisinnius based his objections to these programs on a conservative interpretation of a canon of the Synod in Trullo (692), which he read as a ban on all external exploitation of the properties of ecclesiastical institutions.³⁷ Sisinnius' bold action would make him a hero to the opponents of the

³³ Theophanes, *Chronographia a.m.* 6302, ed. Karl de Boor (Leipzig, 1883-5) = Dölger, *Regesten* No. 374.

³⁴ Ed. Ihor Ševčenko, *Byzantion* 35 (1965) 564-74.

³⁵ Lemerle, "Charistiares", pp. 12-13.

³⁶ Grumel, *Regestes* No. 809, recorded by Balsamon, *Comm. ad C. Nicaen. II*, c. 13 (R&P 2.613-4). For *ἐπίδοσις*, see Herman, "Ricerche", pp. 330-1; this program is attested as the first decade of the tenth century by Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus, *Epist.* No. 123 (914-8).

³⁷ *C. Trull.* (962), c. 49 (R&P 2.423).

χαριστική in the late eleventh century, but in his own day, he was unable to prevent Basil II from continuing to grant out imperial monasteries under the program.³⁸

The strong minded emperor was determined to promote his own policy in spite of the patriarch's unwillingness to cooperate. His famous novel of 996 illustrates his personal perception of the issues.³⁹ By that time, the operation of the χαριστική had opened a loophole in the imperial agrarian legislation, which forbade transfers of land from the peasants to the magnates. The problem concerned small monastic foundations erected by groups of peasants, which experienced the usual administrative crisis when the original founders passed away. The local bishops had been intervening at that point, annexing the foundations as diocesan monasteries, and then granting them out to wealthy magnate benefactors under the χαριστική.⁴⁰ Canon law obligated the bishops to see to it that the ecclesiastical character of the foundations was preserved,⁴¹ but they could not themselves bear the burden of administering them, so the

³⁸ John V the Oxite, Λόγος, Ch. 9, ed. Gautier, lines 264-7, and Balsamon, *Comm. ad C. Nicaen. II*, c. 13 (R&P 2.614.17-18).

³⁹ Basil II, *Novella* (996), Ch. 3, *JGR* 3.313-5 = Dölger, *Regesten* No. 783.

⁴⁰ *JGR* 3.313.18 - 314.1: . . . εύρίσκεται ἄρ ὡς λέγουσιν εἰς πολλὰ τῶν χωρίων, ὅτι ἐποίησέ τις χωρίτης ἐκκλησίαν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον τόπον καὶ ἀφώρισε ταύτην τὴν ἰδίαν μοῖραν [βουλομένων καὶ τῶν συγχωριτῶν αὐτοῦ], ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μοναχὸς καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐν αὐτῇ ἕως ἔξῃ, ἐποίησε δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ἄλλος χωρίτης καὶ ἕτερος ὁμοίως, καὶ ἐγένοντο δύο καὶ τρεῖς ἐκεῖ μοναχοὶ. εἴτα τελευτησάντων αὐτῶν κατέσχε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου μητροπολίτης τυχὸν ἢ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ ἰδιοποιήσατο ταύτην καὶ ὠνόμασε μοναστήριον, καὶ τὰ μὲν τῶν τοιούτων μοναστηρίων αὐτοὶ ἐκείνοι κατέχοντες οἱ μητροπολίται ἢ ἐπίσκοποι τὰ δὲ κατὰ δωρεὰν δυνατοῖς τισι διδόντες πλεονεκτοῦσι τὰ χωρία καὶ ἀδικοῦσι καὶ ἐξαλείφουσιν·

⁴¹ E.g., *C. Chalc.* (451), c. 24 (R&P 2.271): Τὰ ἅπαξ καθιερωθέντα μονστήρια, κατὰ γνώμην ἐπισκόπου, μένειν εἰς το διηνεκές μοναστήρια. καὶ τὰ ἀνήκοντα αὐτοῖς πράγματα φυλάττεσθαι...

only recourse was to use the *χαριστική* as a means of obtaining financial assistance from the laity. As a result (intended or not), the magnates continued to gain communal property in violation of the spirit of the earlier agrarian legislation.

Basil II ordered that these institutions should be returned to the peasant communities as communal *εὐκτήρια* (oratories). The bishops and metropolitans were to enjoy their traditional rights of the eucharistic offering (*ἀναφορά*), approval of clerical nominations (*σφραγίς*), and correction of spiritual errors (*διόρθωσις*), but were not to receive the customary dues (*συνήθεια*) of an overlord.⁴² These foundations then were to be considered as communal proprietary churches and not as diocesan monasteries liable to the *χαριστική*. The emperor's respect for the property rights of laymen in ecclesiastical foundations is remarkably consistent with his earlier decision in the Piperatos case.

Basil II allowed several notable exceptions to his general rule for the status of these churches. Those *εὐκτήρια* which were under imperial *πρόνοια*, i.e., recipients of *σολέμνια* (dedicatory offerings) or *φωταψίαι* (allowances for the expenses of illumination), were to remain as integral parts of the public church system, but were ineligible for concession under the *χαριστική*.⁴³ Communal institutions with a complement of at least eight monks and enjoying a proper endowment also called for special treatment. The ecclesiastical authorities could grant them out to whomever they wished.⁴⁴ The emperor also permitted the hierarchy to grant out large private monasteries of ancient foundation under the *χαριστική* if they had become totally depopulated.⁴⁵

⁴² *Novella* (996), *JGR* 3.314.1-18.

⁴³ *JGR* 3.314.18-24.

⁴⁴ *JGR* 3.314.26 - 315.3.

⁴⁵ *JGR* 3.315.13-19: τὰ δὲ ιδιόστατα καὶ ὅσα μεγάλα μοναστήρια ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἦσαν, εἰ τάχα καὶ μοναχοὺς ἄρτι πολλοὺς οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀμελείᾳ τυχὸν τοῦ μητροπολίτου ἢ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου χωρὶς μοναχῶν εἶσι, διοριζόμεθα ταῦτα καὶ πάλιν ὑπὸ τὰς μητροπόλεις καὶ τὰς ἐπισκοπὰς εἶναι καὶ δωρεῖσθαι καὶ παραπέμπειν αὐτὰ τοῦς τε μητροπολίτας καὶ τοῦς ἐπισκόπους ὅπου καὶ ὅτε θέλουσιν.

The exceptions enumerated in the law show that Basil II was trying to chart a careful course, allowing the bishops sufficient latitude to arrange for the restoration of needy institutions while insuring that these projects did not upset further the balance of land tenure in favor of wealthy benefactors.

The emperor's law also shows that the ecclesiastical hierarchy was following his example in electing to participate in the *χαριστική*. Yet Basil II was soon to anger the hierarchy with another measure more clearly opposed to their interests. This was his law of 1002, which required wealthy property owners to assume the burden, known as the *ἀλληλέγγυον*, of paying the defaulted taxes of their poorer neighbors.⁴⁶ Sisinnius II's successor Sergius II (999-1019) led a number of bishops and abbots in protesting to the emperor against the severe burden which this law had placed on ecclesiastical institutions.⁴⁷ Basil II, whose scorn of learned advice was notorious, refused to change his mind.

The emperor evidently placed a premium on obtaining the cooperation of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the use of the *χαριστική*. His law on the *ἀλληλέγγυον*, issued at a time when the patriarchate was still declining to participate in the program, must have placed great pressure on the dissenters for cooperation. Faced with this burden of increased taxation, the participating hierarchy began to grant out even wealthy institutions — a crucial step in the deflection of the *χαριστική* from its original goals — in order to escape the new fiscal obligations which they could not easily have paid themselves.

⁴⁶ Dölger, *Regesten* No. 793.

⁴⁷ Scylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum*, ed. Thurn, p. 347.

In 1016, Sergius II relented and issued a decree reversing his predecessor's opposition to the *χαριστική*.⁴⁸ To do this, the patriarch advanced an alternate interpretation of the relevant Trullan canon, according to which donations of monasteries were prohibited only when secularization of the facilities resulted. His choice of this interpretation was a bow to the common contemporary opinion that the derivation of personal profits was not an inappropriate use of an ecclesiastical foundation.⁴⁹

Perhaps Sergius II hoped to curry favor with the irascible emperor in the hope of a concession on the *ἀλληλέγγυον*. Basil II had promised to give the matter due consideration when he returned from the Bulgarian War. Upon Basil's victory in 1019, Sergius pressed once again for repeal, but the emperor still turned a deaf ear to the request.⁵⁰ So if Sergius II had hoped to trade patriarchal participation in the *χαριστική* for repeal of the law on *ἀλληλέγγυον*, he miscalculated badly. Basil II never did relent, and the resumption of patriarchal grants under the *χαριστική* reopened another category of institutions liable to the abuses which plagued the program almost from its inception.

⁴⁸ Grumel, *Regestes* No. 821, recorded by Balsamon, *Comm. ad C. Nicaen. II*, c. 13 (R&P 2.614).

⁴⁹ Cf. *Peira* 15.8, *JGR* 1.44, a case judged (before 1034) by Eustathius Rhomaïos, which involved the determination of the correct distribution of income derived from the private church of a village in the theme of Chaldia. See discussion by Ahrweiler, "Charisticariat", p. 8 n. 43, and by Emil Herman, "Chiese private e diritto di fondazione negli ultimi secoli dell'impero bizantino", *OCP* 12 (1946) 302-321, at 306-9.

⁵⁰ Scylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum*, ed. Thurn, p. 365.

The decentralized nature of the awards process undoubtedly made it hard to police, and the temptation for the concessionaires to exploit their temporally-limited grants in wanton fashion was extremely strong.⁵¹ Perhaps the authorities had hoped that the new benefactors would pattern their behavior on that of the conscientious founding families, but the newly-assigned patrons lacked their piety and enlightened self-interest. Surprisingly, the church's perennial difficulties with lay tenants of its landed properties (e.g., their reckless exhaustion of the soil) did not alert it to the problems eventually encountered in granting out entire institutions for exploitation.⁵² Now, instead of single properties, the institutions themselves and all their landed estates were liable to blatant misuse and even secularization. Yet these very abuses in turn were to stimulate an ecclesiastical reform movement in the late eleventh century opposed to all private profiteering in the management of religious institutions.⁵³

⁵¹ Alexius Studites, *Hypomnema A* (1027) (R&P 5.20-1)

⁵² See, for example, the regulation of these problems in *NJ* 7.3.2 (535) and *NJ* 120.8 (544); cf. Maspéro, *Papyrus grecs*, No. 67087.

⁵³ This is the subject of my "A Byzantine Ecclesiastical Reform Movement," *Mediaevalia et Humanistica* 12 (1984) 1-16.

BYZANTINISCHE FORSCHUNGEN

Internationale Zeitschrift für
Byzantinistik

herausgegeben

von

ADOLF M. HAKKERT und WALTER E. KAEGI, Jr.

BAND X



VERLAG ADOLF M. HAKKERT - AMSTERDAM
1985